

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XXXI. APRIL 1883.

ART. I.—PALGRAVE'S 'VISIONS OF ENGLAND.'

The Visions of England. By FRANCIS T. PALGRAVE, M.A.
(London, 1881.)

THIS book will have been already in the hands of many of our readers. In an excellently written preface Mr. Palgrave describes it as 'an attempt to offer, not poems on every critical moment or conspicuous man in our long annals, but single lyrical pictures of such leading or typical characters in English history, and only such, as have seemed to him amenable to a strictly poetical treatment.' Those who know anything of his father's writings will appreciate the touching utterance of a 'hope that the love of truth and the love of England are his by inheritance, in a degree sufficient to exempt this book (the labour of several years) from infidelity to either.' Patriotism of a refined and truly moral type is indeed apparent whenever Mr. Palgrave speaks of the 'dear land where new is one with old,' 'land of the most law-loving, the most free;' and there is very much in this book which will go straight home to any heart that is at once English and Christian. We must confess that, in our opinion, there would have been still more if the accomplished author (who condemns the modern hexameter as unsatisfactory) had been more sparing in the employment of unfamiliar, or in some cases eccentric, metrical systems, within which—we must add, not within which alone—occur repeatedly lines so unrhythmical as to irritate the reader's ear, constructions so involved as to draw his attention to their grammar, and such a jerk and strain in the expression of 'the passion of the moment' as rather to chill than to stimulate his sympathy. Cases of this sort occur in 'Crossing Solway,'

VOL. XVI.—NO. XXXI. B

370619

'The Return of Law,' 'Whitehall Gallery,' 'A Dirge of Repentance,' and 'Trafalgar.' Be the theme never so inspiring, poetry trammelled by such conditions cannot stir the blood or grasp the memory like 'The Spanish Armada,' or 'The Battle of Naseby,' or 'Bonnie Dundee,' or 'The Gathering of the Clans' in *Waverley*, or 'The Battle of the Baltic.' Here and there, too, in the book there are quaint terms, such as 'feral' for funereal (p. 302) and the 'riverain mead' (p. 71). Milton's classicalisms in 'Lycidas' do not reconcile us to such an apostrophe to England as—

'O land whom the *gods*, loving most, most sorely in wisdom
have tried' (p. 202);

and there seems to be some confusion in such a phrase as—

'Baptized with the *chrisom* of gore' (p. 204).

On the other hand, not only is page after page rich in bits of true jewellery—delicate touches, sometimes Tennysonian in their finished grace—such as those which show us Raleigh's vessel floating

'Up wide Amana, islanded with palms
Twinned in their beauty on the mirroring calms' (p. 145),

or the

'Waft of pearly haze'

which

'Lies on the sapphire field of air
So radiant and so still,'

or the smoke

'Floating in white repose
O'er the grey peace of cottage-walls half seen' (p. 314),

or the valley which—

'With all its wealth outspread of harvest hopes,
Half green, half russet gold, runs up
In a fair tapestry shaken o'er the slopes' (p. 327).

Not only do we meet with felicitous epithets illuminating a whole idea, such as 'the small *parochial* world of sight and touch' (p. 53); not only are some of the poems fraught with meditative force and depth, and ennobled by a loyalty to right even when wrong may seem to have conquered; but the readers of certain charming 'Hymns' published fourteen years ago, especially of 'The Day-star,' 'Lost and Found,' and 'The King's Messenger,' will find their charm reproduced in the simplicity of 'Paulinus and Edwin' (the scene at Godmundingham), 'The Captive Child' (Princess Elizabeth Stuart, whose

dreary death-room is one of the sights of Carisbrook Castle), 'The Childless Mother' (Anne after the death of the Duke of Gloucester), and, above all, in the following lines, which conclude the poem on the 'The Battle of Towton Field,' fought on a Palm Sunday :—

'Love, o'er palms in triumph strown,
 Passing, through the crowd alone—
 Silent mid the exulting cry,—
 To Jerusalem to die :
 Thou, foreknowing all, didst know
 How Thy blood in vain would flow,
 How our madness oft would prove
 Recreant to the law of love ;
 Wrongs that men from men endure
 Doing Thee to death once more :'

verses of such a character that we hardly complain of the imperfect rhyme in the last couplet.

Mr. Palgrave's 'Visions' begin early enough, with the tin trade, of which, in far distant ages, Belerium, or the Land's End, was the mart. Anyone who has seen that weird spot will recognize the truth of the description. We cannot say that we care much for 'The Dream of Maxen Wledig,' the usurping Emperor Maximus. Mr. Freeman, perhaps, would hardly admit its right to a place in such a series ; but his enthusiasm for the prince with whose name 'there is no other in history to compare'¹ would be satisfied by the tribute to our great Alfred—

'O much vex'd life, for us too short, too dear !
 The laggard body lame behind the soul ;
 Pain, that ne'er marr'd the mind's serene control ;
 Breathing on earth heaven's æther atmosphere,
 God with thee, and the love that casts out fear,' &c.

Anyone who has gazed on that broad stone in the cloisters of Westminster which professes to cover the remains of monastic victims of the Black Death will read with special interest the wailing lines which represent the horror and anguish of English folk in 1348-9, when 'the swift soft stroke of the air' laid low such thousands. In this poem 'the glory of song blazing out from the choir' sounds like an echo of Keble's 'Christmas-day.' The utter lack of moral interest in the Wars of the Roses is brought home to us in the poem on Towton Field ; but we must remark that 'the monks' could not look out from York Minster on that scene of conflict, for

¹ *Hist. Norm. Cong.* i. 49.

the metropolitan church of the north was all along a home of secular canons. Monasticism is kindly dealt with, as offering a 'haven' to weak hearts. The Middle Ages are set before us as a time of

'Extremes and contrasts, where the good
Was more than human in its tenderness
Of chivalry. . . .
And evil raging with a wild excess
Of more than brutal,' &c. (p. 99).

One of the most interesting features of the book is the protest which it repeatedly makes against 'opinions current during the last fifty years' (Preface, p. xiv), not only as to the events of the seventeenth century, particularly referred to in that passage, but as to those of the Tudor period. The typical member of that 'hard-hearted' dynasty¹ stands out again as a self-willed and blood-stained tyrant, 'the royal robber,' the man of 'insatiate lust,' of 'brutal, selfish sway;' and Mr. J. A. Froude's *Cultus Henrici Octavi* is about as severely handled in verse as formerly by Mr. Goldwin Smith in prose:—

'With casuist sneer o'erglossing works of blood,
Miscalling evil good;
Before some despot-hero falsely named
Grovvelling in shameful worship unashamed' (p. 110).

We cannot refrain from quoting the next lines, which seem to us, on the whole, the noblest in the book. It should perhaps be explained that the poem is on the murder of Sir Thomas More:—

'But they of the great race
Look equably, not caring much, on foe
And fame and misesteem of man below;
And with forgiving radiance on their face,
And eyes that aim beyond the bourne of space,
Seeing the invisible, glory-clad, go up,
And drink the absinthine cup,
Fill'd nectar-deep by the dear love of Him
Slain at Jerusalem
To free them from a tyrant worse than this,
Changing brief anguish for the heart of bliss.'

For another exquisite passage on 'the exaltation of the humble,' on those children of light who 'conquer in their fall,' and win hearts from their apparent ruin, we must refer to a poem on Falkland's grave (p. 175).

¹ So once named, in the writer's hearing, by the late Dean Stanley.

Mr. Palgrave's view of Mary Stuart is indicated in the lines called 'Crossing Solway.' He does not, in the now reigning fashion, treat her as certainly guilty; but neither does he seem able to follow Mr. Hosack in asserting her entire innocence. In one stanza he speaks of her as 'seduced by men of blood, in her passionate mood, by crime to avenge her on crime,' *i.e.* to take Darnley's life in revenge for Rizzio's. Yet he adds—

'Was she guilty? Who knows? for the craft of her foes
Stamps her with the shame of the night;'

as if the 'Glasgow letter' found in the fateful casket, beginning, 'Being gone from the place where I had left my heart,' and characterized, as Mr. Hosack says,¹ by a brutality and depravity which exceed the most revolting pictures 'in the realm of fiction,' were a forgery dictated by deadly hate. But he assumes the reality of her 'fiery love' for Bothwell, and hints at a peculiar explanation of it, which, however, would seem to require that this 'love' should not begin earlier than April 24, 1567, when she was taken by Bothwell to Dunbar, and should end before her marriage on May 15, when she told the French ambassador that she 'never could be happy, wishing only for death.' On this showing, the three letters alleged 'to have been written' by her to Bothwell from Stirling, *before* he met and took her to Dunbar, must also be set aside as spurious. In the poem before us Mr. Palgrave repeatedly speaks of Mary as a 'girl' in 1567-8; but she was born in December of 1542, and had seen only too much of life in the years between her French marriage and the tragical close of her actual reign. Scott, in *The Abbot*, calls her 'a grown dame' at Lochleven. On the question whether she was actually a party to Babington's regicidal plot Mr. Palgrave says that, be her part in those 'crimes' what it might—

'On her head
Least stains of gore-guiltiness lie;'

but his allusion to Burghley and Walsingham, as having, by their inhuman craft, 'tempted her astray' to her destruction, may imply that he regards the alleged letter to Babington as genuine, even in those passages which contemplated the murder of Elizabeth. Mr. Palgrave is for once inaccurate as to a detail: Morton did not enter Mary's room with Darnley and Ruthven on the night of Rizzio's murder.

¹ *Mary, Queen of Scots, and her Accusers*, i. 198. He dwells also on its internal inconsistencies.

'Elizabeth at Tilbury' does not please us: it is blusterous and unmusical. We pass by the lines which dwell on Raleigh, on Sidney, on Herbert, on Charles I.'s third daughter, Anne (who died repeating Psalm xiii. 3), on Hampden, and on Strafford—only remarking that Mr. Palgrave calls Strafford a hero dying for order, as Hampden for freedom—each 'seeing and taking for all his side of England's shield' (p. 169). While he abhors the 'sullen' fanaticism of Puritanism, he owns 'the one great blot' in Charles I.'s character, and also his incapacity to see that the age of Tudor government was past. But what of Cromwell? The pains which Mr. Palgrave has bestowed on this, the most massive and imperial figure on the great Civil War stage, suggest to his readers a view of that 'soaring, enormous, labyrinthine soul' which 'differs widely,' as he tells us in a note (p. 177), from that presented by Carlyle, whom indeed he alludes to as a worshipper of 'power for power's own sake,' an idolatry against which, in these pages, he repeatedly and energetically protests. He recognizes him (who would not?) as 'great,' yet adds, 'with an earth-born greatness, untempered, untuned;' 'least willing of despots,' 'despot despite himself;' 'not bloodthirsty by birth,' but deeming blood for certain purposes 'just liquor 'twas needful to pour'—as in Ireland. Cromwell, in his eyes, is 'a hero warped and scarred by guile and coarseness,' wishing to govern by law, yet 'goaded by fate on that iron-tracked path he has framed;' 'wishing to be loved, and wondering 'to the close why he cannot win hearts.' And as to his sincerity? Mr. Palgrave in his appendix partly quotes, and in his verses substantially embodies, the view of 'a singularly acute and weighty analyst of character,' Dr. Mozley, who, in his essay on Cromwell (an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April 1846¹), described him as keeping a conscience which was amenable to his ambition, a sense of religious obligation which did not 'chasten or correct his motives, which not only let him do what he liked, but urged him vehemently to do it.' But it is surely unfair to call the great Protector a Cæsar Attila (p. 231); and Mr. Palgrave in an earlier passage had almost absolved him for the sake of his 'passionate love' of England. In the notes and appendix, which should be carefully compared with the text, 'the terrorism of Cromwell's government, and the almost universal hatred which it inspired' (p. 178), 'the ever-increasing unsuccess of his career' (p. 345), and the indelible impression made on the

¹ Mozley's *Essays*, i. 317.

Irish mind by the 'savage rule' of the man who then concentrated the force of English Protestantism (p. 348), are set forth with a plainness which may be at once startling and healthful for those whose ideas have been formed since Hallam's influence began to wane. It is to Hallam's judgments that Mr. Palgrave repeatedly refers, as to those of 'the one man of even weight and balance' among the historians of this great era, except, perhaps, as he says in one place, in regard to Strafford. It is the fashion to abuse the Restoration: but Mr. Palgrave celebrates it as 'The Return of Law,' quoting in one of his notes a weighty sentence from Professor Seeley to that effect. He does not profess to share Macaulay's enthusiasm for William of Orange; and, while owning his greatness, dwells on the coldness which kept him alone 'in glacier isolation,' and made him 'unjust to his better self' in the violation of the Limerick 'pledges.' Just now, perhaps, it will be difficult to assimilate Mr. Palgrave's keen sense of England's misdoing towards Ireland as expressed in the verses called 'A Dirge of Repentance.' Yet amid the indignation, almost the despair, which Irish crime has lately produced in English hearts, it is a duty to forget neither the barbarities of the Elizabethan campaigns in Ireland, of Coote and his fellows in 1641, of the Cromwellians at Drogheda and Wexford, nor the protracted and elaborate tyrannies of the post-Revolution penal code. The Celtic race has a long memory; and there are things which it has not as yet had time to forget.

We must pass lightly over the remaining historical 'Visions.' The best of them, to our mind, are those on Johnson and Washington. Of the former Macaulay remarks in a well-known passage that he is 'more intimately known to posterity than other men are to their contemporaries;' and Mr. Palgrave similarly exclaims—

'Strange fate that bids thee thus, o'er all
The millions veil'd beyond recall,
Amongst us yet in living presence stand !' (p. 257).

The great American hero is celebrated as

'In self-effacement great,
Magnanimous to endure and wait . . .
Master of fate through self-control
And utter stainlessness of soul' (p. 306).

These are but a few of the grand lines devoted to the memory of him whom America acknowledges, in the inscription on his statue in front of the Capitol at Washington, as

'first in war, first in peace, first in the love of his countrymen ;' of whom Mr. Ludlow says in his excellent little *History of the War of American Independence*, that 'no more typical Englishman ever lived.'

We can notice but one more poem : it is that which is headed 'Things Visible and Invisible.' The readers of Mr. Palgrave's hymns will remember two sets of verses on 'Faith and Sight in the Latter Days' and 'The Reign of Law.' The poem before us is as it were a development of these. It begins by picturing the imperious pressure of visible and material life, tending to crowd out faith in the invisible ; and the difficulty of associating any real and present interests with the events of a life spent in Palestine 'so long ago, so long.' As the poet said in his earlier book—

'Dim tracts of time divide
Those golden days from me ;
Thy voice comes strange o'er years of change ;
How can I follow Thee ?
Comes faint and far Thy voice,
From vales of Galilee
Thou art a star, far off, too far,
Too far to follow Thee ?'

so now he contrasts

'The world devouring with impassion'd stride
Its history
The dazzling Present with his glory-show,'

with

'That scarce visible life in Syrian land,
Lost and time-buried by the Dead Sea strand' (p. 320).

So it is : to many minds which have not by any means formally parted with their faith this warfare of sight against faith constitutes a trial of the sorest kind. The prayers they say, the Scriptures they read, seem to belong to a region far out of reach, to be untranslatable into the language of everyday work and experience, to have but a tentative, proximate, perhaps, they even think, a conventional, value. It is not with them 'I disbelieve,' or 'I reject,' but 'I cannot realize, appropriate, enter into, and live by.' They walk in dimness, tending to become darkness : perhaps, in reciting or listening to the Creed, they make even desperate efforts to grasp at something solid and substantial behind or above those venerable words ; and if still the endeavour fails, if still the haze will not lift, they are tempted to listen to secularism in some one of its more cultured forms, as to a voice saying,

'You *feel* that all this is unverifiable. Give up the dream which you once took for a reality ; be content with tangible certainties.

" If scanty all we know,
At least 'tis science palpable and pure :
We see ! Thus far, our footsteps are secure ;
No more we ask than sense and senses show,
And Hope and Faith, vain luxuries, forego."

To such materialistic preachments, advocating a self-abasement which can lead to no exaltation, Mr. Palgrave had thus answered in his earlier poem :—

' If this be all in all,
Life but one mode of force,
Law but the plan which binds
The sequences in course,
All essence, all design
Shut out from mortal ken ;
We bow to Nature's fate,
And drop the style of *men*. . . .
But if our life be life,
And thought, and will, and love
Not vague, unconscious airs
That o'er wild harp-strings move ;
If consciousness be aught
Of all it seems to be,
And souls are something more
Than lights that gleam and flee ;
Though dark the road that leads us thither,
The heart *must* ask its whence and whither.'

So now, in the poem before us, he compares the materialistic influence to the glamour of a Circe, which makes men forget their true home ; and then, apparently following in a track indicated by Dr. Mozley in his second lecture on Miracles, he asks, in effect, whether we can, after all, verify by scientific tests the conclusions which we lean on respecting the world of things tangible ; whether we can dispense, in *that* act, with presumptions and acts of faith ; whether, to be consistent, the sceptic must not carry 'nescience' yet further, until the path of life becomes no thoroughfare ; whether, in fine, it were not better to admit, or rather to urge, that alike in things material and things spiritual we have a light which, though partial, is yet true :—

'Tis reason bids you scorn the facile sneer
That bars the search for truth beyond the sphere :
It is the weak who doubt, the strong who hold
The resolute faith where new is one with old.'

We have quoted, perhaps, too much from this book, but, at any rate, more than enough to show that the author has established his place among those 'makers' who have been pleaders at once for righteousness and for faith; that his influence, as far as it is felt, will be altogether in aid of what is noble and lovely and of good report; and that, notwithstanding any objections which may be made to the forms in which he has here and there clothed his thought, he has supplied us with not a few contributions to some future *Golden Treasury*.

ART. II.—LANGEN'S HISTORY OF THE
ROMAN CHURCH.

Geschichte der Römischen Kirche, bis zum Pontificate Leo's I.
Quellenmässig dargestellt von Dr. JOSEPH LANGEN,
Professor an der Universität zu Bonn. (Bonn, 1881.)

THE book before us has those less important qualities which attract students, such, at least, as are not deterred at starting by a German elaborateness of discussion. Its arrangement is excellent. It has an Index and full Table of Contents. Its references, where we have verified them, have proved to be in almost all cases accurate.¹ Moreover, it is excellently printed in a clear Roman type. But it has the greater qualities also which are to be required in history. The student is impressed with the thoroughness of the knowledge on which the work is based. The whole ground is gone elaborately over. No source of information from which light can be thrown on the early history of the Roman Church is neglected. The basis of knowledge seems complete, the investigation thorough-going. Nothing is sacrificed to the desire of popularity. Knowledge, no doubt, goes but a little way in the making of history. We need the temper of criticism to sift and reduce to scientific order and distinction the mass of materials. But here too Professor Langen seems to us eminently qualified for his great task. He is not conservative merely, but critical. He does not primarily defend or attack, but investigates. He is thoroughly in the full light of modern historical science. Once again, criticism must have its basis in sympathy; and Professor Langen has that sympathy in writing Church history which the temper of faith alone seems to be able to give. He writes the history of the Church as a believer in the Church. We have here, then, a history of a most important period and current of Church history by a man of unimpeachable knowledge, sincere faith, and vigorous criticism. Need we say that we believe this work to be a most important addition to ecclesiastical history?

Of course, one who writes on a subject which has been blackened with controversy at every stage cannot avoid a controversial tone, however much the main aim and intention

¹ P. 106, however, note 2, *H. E.* iv. 14, should be *H. E.* iv. 10; and p. 327, Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 121, should apparently be i. 95.

of his work may be, as Professor Langen's is, positive and critical rather than polemical. Professor Langen, in being true to history, finds himself in an attitude of antagonism to those modern Roman claims which have triumphed over it. He represents the position of the Old Catholics; and we cannot forbear to say that if any ecclesiastical position affords, by its extreme anomaly and discomfort to one who really values Church communion, a pledge of the intellectual honesty and disinterestedness of those who occupy it, it is the Old Catholic position. When we read a history of the Roman Church by an Old Catholic divine who is really true to his name, we seem to be having expanded before us the progress of an intellectual conviction which forced a man to cut himself adrift from all that could make his religious position satisfactory and comfortable. An Old Catholic historian ought to be an impartial historian. His convictions have cost him much, and gained him nothing except clearness of conscience.

We proceed, then, to give some account of this important work—to give, we say, some account of it; for it would be impossible, in the space open to us, even to attempt to traverse anew and for ourselves the early life of the Roman Church, and offer an independent judgment, with the grounds it rests upon, on the topics which present themselves. We attempt the humbler task of following the lines of Professor Langen's work, emphasizing points which seem of special interest and importance, and only very occasionally venturing on the ground of divergent opinion.

The Roman Church, then, is exhibited to us in a careful survey of all that concerns its origin as springing out of the Gentile environment of the strictly Jewish body at Rome. A half-developed, half-organized¹ society when S. Paul wrote to it, it receives its completer development under the influence of the personal presence of S. Paul and S. Peter. S. Peter seems to have come to Rome not much sooner, at any rate, than S. Paul left it on the conclusion of the first captivity in A.D. 63. His activity there is marked, Professor Langen holds, probably by his First General Epistle, more certainly by the Gospel of S. Mark. He dates his martyrdom at Rome with hesitation in A.D. 67.

To omit the intervening period,² we find a special interest

¹ 'Im Flüsse des Werdens' 'keimartig,' p. 32. But the reality of organization involved in Rom. xii. 5 ff. is emphasized, p. 31.

² We notice that the Professor inclines, on external grounds (p. 71), to the traditional later date of the Apocalypse, not noticing the strong internal difficulties of this view.

188
att
gar
Ep
sem
as
of
con
Joh
Chu
wou
men
the
earl
wh
sec
cess
this
hav
reco
rari
the
late
the
Her
the
Chu
rega
empa
Coll
Apo
Clem
'Th
bined
Apo
siast
meas
there
i.e., i

1
2
securi
3
Churc
to. 87
Epistl

attaching to the account given here of the episcopal organization of the Church of Rome at the period of the Epistle of Clement. Our author regards the—in the modern sense of the word—episcopal form of Church government as having been implanted on the Churches by the influence of S. John. 'The monarchical government of the Asiatic communities may be fairly attributed to the Apostle S. John' (p. 97). The earlier monarchical government of the Church of Jerusalem has special and personal causes which would not hold elsewhere: the monarchical form of government as impressed by S. John is Catholic, and belongs to the Church as such. It obtained everywhere from a very early date, but in part of the West less rapidly than elsewhere. When Hegesippus visited Rome in the middle of the second century, he did not find a recognized list of the succession of bishops there, but made it (p. 101).¹ In making this list he may, Dr. Langen with great probability conceives, have given scope to his Jewish instincts (pp. 100, 101), and recorded as successors bishops who were really contemporaries. So Dr. Langen accounts for the uncertainties about the early succession of the bishops at Rome.² Traces of this late development of episcopal organization he finds even in the occasional vagueness of the language of the 'Shepherd' of Hermas (p. 125). At any rate, he throws himself fully into the point of view which regards the government of the Church in Clement's day as collegiate.³ This view alone he regards as critically tenable. On the other hand, he is equally emphatic in the position that each member of the Episcopal College was regarded as the inheritor of the full power of the Apostolic ministry. 'The ordinary Church-presidents (of the Clementine period) are called successors of the Apostles.' 'Through the simple ceremony of laying on of hands, combined perhaps with the invocation of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles handed on to the bishops or presbyters the full ecclesiastical powers, complete and undiminished, to all in like measure.' This he regards as certain (p. 82), and it was therefore from motives of expedience that the 'episcopal'—*i.e.*, if the word may be allowed, non-episcopal—form of

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 30.

² He reckons the tradition of the succession as reaching back with security only to Xystus (p. 103).

³ P. 71, 80-83. The evidence drawn from the comparison of the Church officers to the three orders of the Jewish hierarchy he sets aside (d. 87, note 1) as too vague to stand against the clear implication of the Epistle.

government superseded the collegiate in the Churches; that is to say, it was found convenient 'for the future (p. 83) to hand over the full ecclesiastical authority in each community to a single individual, leaving to the rest of the presidents only a diminished share in the ecclesiastical powers.'

'We can therefore,' so the Professor sums up, 'neither defend the position which represents Christ as having Himself instituted two sharply-distinguished Church offices, the Episcopate and the Presbyterate—a position which is historically and exegetically untenable—nor the other position, which represents the Episcopate as a discovery of the sub-Apostolic age, but that which is opposed to both these, and represents the *Presbyterate as having developed* out of the limitation to a single individual of the succession to the full episcopal power.'

It is our earnest belief that the Church will be only a gainer, alike in ecclesiastical polemics as in historical accuracy, if this theory of the development of the Ministry be at any rate accepted as tenable. It cannot surely be impressed on people too clearly that the basis of the ecclesiastical doctrine of ministerial authority lies *primarily*, not in the Apostolic antiquity of the threefold form of the ministry, but—*primarily, we say*—in the Divine authority of the principle of ministerial *delegation*; and to this principle the witness of the Clementine Epistle is not ambiguous.¹

We have not time to linger over the interesting section (§ ix.) which Dr. Langen devotes to the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. Accepting the later date of this book, in accordance with the Canon of Muratori,² he finds in it the record of an earnest appeal of the prophetic spirit to the Church of an age when Christianity was becoming worldly; an appeal to earnest repentance on the ground that the quickly-coming day of Christ was only lingering through God's long suffering in order to give the elect time to prepare (p. 131). Only just referring to this in passing, and omitting not a little else that is interesting, we will endeavour to give rather more careful attention to the picture which Dr. Langen draws of

¹ Dr. Langen does not, as far as we can see, make any allusion to Bishop Lightfoot's work on the Epistle of Clement, nor to Bishop Wordsworth's admirable emendation of the text, *Δαυαίδες καὶ Δίρκα* (chap. vi. Langen, p. 52) into *ναύιδες παιδίσκαι*. Later, again, we notice no allusion to Bishop Wordsworth's work on Hippolytus. Indeed (with the exception of allusions to Canon Mason's work on the Diocletian Persecution, and a note on p. 559) we have not noticed in this book much trace of English contributions to theological science.

² About A.D. 140. Montanism he regards as the distorted expression of the same spirit which animates the *Shepherd* (p. 132).

the p
centu
nessi

T

doctr

unde

tion

had

this

imper

of the

Henc

seeds

new s

a sec

diffus

presen

of the

much

two v

She n

Script

The C

the fir

But it

Christ

gather

fancy

and a

the Cl

novel

stant a

cession

witnes

witnes

whom

you wa

it there

with w

Hence

the ple

And th

¹ Th
among t
² Ire

the position of the Church of Rome in the end of the second century in relation to the Church's general function of witnessing to the Apostolic tradition.

The Church never felt the need of a secure and firm doctrinal tradition more keenly than in the second century, under the pressure of all the various forms of Gnostic aberration and Montanist enthusiasm; and no part of the Church had more abundant opportunity of becoming conscious of this need than the Church of Rome. Rome was, from her imperial position, the point of convergence for the intercourse of the civilized world (p. 109). Men of all lands went thither. Hence this was the easiest place from which to scatter the seeds of a new doctrine. Each innovator, each author of a new system or enthusiasm, felt that if he could once establish a secure school at Rome he would ensure the universal diffusion of his ideas. Hence the fact with which history presents us, that leader after leader of the heretical tendencies of the second century came to Rome. In Rome, then, as much as anywhere, was the need felt of stable tradition. In two ways did the Church set herself to meet this need. She made her first formal efforts to collect the Canon of the Scriptures, with which heretics were playing fast and loose. The Canon of Muratori presents us with an early—probably the first—effort of Latin Christianity in this direction (p. 164). But it was apparent that the Scriptures could not stand alone. Christianity was not a new thing from age to age to be gathered from written documents afresh according to the fancy of the readers; it was a living tradition of doctrine, and a living store of grace committed to an organic body, the Church. Thus over against the constant outpouring of novel Gnostic conceptions, the Church set her stable and constant and universal tradition, preserved in her ministerial succession in the Apostolic sees. The Church stands out as the witness and preserver of primitive tradition. The Church is a witness. In each Apostolic see presides a successor of those to whom the Apostles committed the Apostolic tradition.¹ Do you want to learn the Apostolic verity? You must go and seek it there 'where is the store of the Divine graces,'² and from those with whom is the succession of the Church from the Apostles.' Hence the significance of the Apostolic succession. It is the pledge in each Church of the continuity of the tradition. And the further security of the unchanged character of the

¹ The Apostles, Professor Langen notices, are not themselves reckoned among the Bishops, but as institutors of the Bishops (pp. 168, 169).

² Iren. iv. 26. 5; Langen, p. 169.

tradition lies in its *universality*. If the relation of the Church to the truth be that of an originative, promulgative *authority*, then she would best fulfil her function through a single central voice; but if (as Irenæus and Tertullian, to whom we specially owe the *formulating* of this conception of the Church tradition, teach) the Church's function is the perhaps humbler one of *witness*, the security of this witness will lie in the *agreement of many and distinct voices*, in *consent*. 'Ecquid verisimile est,' says Tertullian, with his incomparable power of compressing an argument into a phrase, 'ut tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ in unam fidem erraverint?' The strength of the ecclesiastical witness lies in the agreement, the consent of East and West, not in the subordination of the tradition of one part of the Church to the tradition of another. Thus the Roman Church to Tertullian or Irenæus represents one stream of Apostolic witness; and yet the latter perceives in it a special capacity of witness, not such as to make it possible to dispense with the consent of the other parts of the Church, not such as to give it any kind of relation to the truth, other than that of witnessing to a once delivered tradition, but still a special position in relation to this witness. This peculiarity of the Roman Church to Irenæus, lies, as Professor Langen explains his conception, in its 'microcosmic' character. Rome's position in the Church is based on her position in the Empire. She is the centre to which all converge. 'As Rome was the world of that age, in little'—'the epitome of the world,' its 'council-chamber,'—'drawing all nations, cults, schools, tendencies into her bosom, so into the Roman Church streamed believers from all sides together;' and the witness of the Church at Rome had a universality, a microcosmic character to which no other Church could lay claim. 'To this Church,' so Professor Langen renders¹ words which have been the subject of much discussion, 'on account of its pre-eminent position, every Church—that is, the faithful from all sides—must needs come together, and in it the Apostolic tradition has been always preserved by Christians from all parts.'

Nor was this the only special circumstance which thrust greatness upon the Roman Church of this date. To her microcosmic position in the Empire and the Church must be added the religious reverence which accrued to her from association with the great names of Peter and of Paul, and the

¹ Professor Langen has certainly gone further than anyone else in the direction of making his rendering reasonably certain (p. 171, note 1, and p. 172, note 1).

influence which an already old tradition of generous charity to needy Churches had given her. The peace of the Church since the accession of Commodus in A.D. 180 fostered the wealth and influence of the Roman Church. It is under these circumstances that, in the person of Victor, history presents us with the first instance of 'Roman aggression' (p. 186). 'Through his attempt [to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches on the matter of Easter observance] he gave expression for the first time to the idea of the Universal Church finding its constitutional centre of unity in the Church of Rome, even though, as would be expected, this idea was not on the occasion of this first attempt presented in a firmly formulated shape.' The attempt of Victor is important as calling our attention to the early existence of a Roman claim, however undeveloped, to be something which other Churches were not. His complete failure to secure any recognition of his authority (pp. 189-191), and the treatment of his claim by his contemporary, S. Irenæus, and the historian Eusebius, are also important, because they emphasize the fact that from its origin downward the Roman claim is sectional, and from the first in tendency schismatic, wholly wanting in that equal recognition in all parts of the Church which alone could make the Roman claims an integral part of authoritative Christianity. Romanism is one tendency in Christianity—powerful, and, for good and evil, influential—but not the whole of Christianity.

A remarkable connection of discoveries made at widely different epochs in widely different parts of the world has resulted in shedding a light as vivid as it is strange and partial over the history and position of the Roman Church in the obscure period of the early third century. The rapid Latinizing of the Roman Church in the latter half of the century obliterated so completely the memory of the days when its theology was Greek, that Eusebius and Jerome were ignorant of events in her history which the strange accidents of discovery have laid bare to us. A manuscript¹ discovered at Mount Athos in the nineteenth century, brought into unexpected connection with a statue and an inscription discovered at Rome in the sixteenth, reveals to us the great S. Hippolytus—a man 'who stood while his writings were extant in point of authority . . . in the very first rank of theologians of the Ante-Nicene period; and perhaps has no rival at all during that period as a theologian except his master, S. Irenæus,' a

¹ Originally published as the *Philosophumena* of Origen, now recognized as the *Refutatio omnium Hæresium* of Hippolytus.

man whose 'name a breath of ecclesiastical censure has never even dimmed'¹—in the strange light of a violent opponent of his contemporary, the Pope Callistus. This may now be taken as an almost accepted fact in ecclesiastical history. It is S. Hippolytus who pours out the vials of his wrath upon the Pope as a character disreputable from his antecedents, as the destroyer of ecclesiastical discipline in the Church of Rome, as a heresiarch in a direction akin to that of Sabellius. This much may be taken as almost certain. We may take it also as certain that S. Hippolytus and Callistus stand against one another in the Church of Rome² as representatives of two rival schools of theology and discipline. Among theologians who were seeking to formulate the Doctrine of the Trinity were some who tended to emphasize the distinction of the Son from the Father and His subordination in such a way as, occasionally at least, in some of their expressions, to have given the Arians of the next century a plausible excuse for quoting them in their own defence. To this school belonged Tertullian and Hippolytus. On the other side was a school of theologians representing an opposite tendency, accused from the first by their opponents of Patripassianism, and at any rate using language which found its natural explanation in the Sabellian heresy. To this *tendency* at any rate belonged Callistus. This division in theological doctrine was accompanied with a division on matters of discipline. The subordinationist theologians, Tertullian and Hippolytus, advocated a severity of discipline which led Tertullian to Montanism, and has associated traditionally the name of Hippolytus with a Novatianism before Novatian. Callistus, on the other hand, clearly identified himself with laxer tendencies in discipline. Thus much may be regarded as certain. Beyond this is the area of controversy. In the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus how far are we to accept the *ex parte* statements of the former vehement theologian about the Bishop of Rome? Was Callistus an 'heresiarch *ex cathedrâ*,' as Hippolytus says he was? On the one side we have the Bishop of Lincoln accepting simply the statements of S. Hippolytus, and making it matter of history that you have in Callistus a pronounced heresiarch of the Sabellian school on the throne of Rome. On the other hand, you have Dr. Döllinger issuing what has been called an 'Apologia pro Callisto,' but at any rate making it only reasonable to accept Hippolytus' statement with a great deal of reserve. Words—

¹ Newman, *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical* (pp. 220–222).

² A.D. 218–223, approximately.

¹ D
patron
Church
Stephe
quite in

worth and Döllinger have been at issue again as to Hippolytus' statements about Callistus' personal character and his charges against his adversary of gross laxity in matters of discipline. Here again it seems impossible to accept Hippolytus' statement except with very great limitations. On the whole, the controversy has resulted in ranking Hippolytus among theologians whose zeal has been too much for their candour in dealing with an opponent's character and doctrine. This is Dr. Langen's conclusion, who, however, takes a severer view of Callistus than Dr. Döllinger. A very interesting history of the rival tendencies in theology and discipline leads him to a conclusion that Callistus, who excommunicated Sabellius at the same time as he charged Hippolytus with ditheism, was aiming, like Praxeas and Noetus, at a theology which would occupy a middle position; while at the same time there seems no doubt that his theology was vague and unsatisfactory, tending at the very least to reduce the distinction of the Father and the Son to one merely 'accidental,' and to make the real Biblical distinction to be the result only of the Incarnation—a distinction really rather between the Divine and human natures in Christ than between the two Persons in the Trinity (p. 214). On the other hand, Dr. Langen regards Hippolytus' own theology as open to somewhat severe impeachment. We have, in fact, in the theological relation of Hippolytus and Callistus the rivalry of two opposing schools, neither by any means free from reproach, but both together, through their antagonism, a means by which the Church was helped to arrive at a securer expression of the Triune Being of God than Scripture revealed.

As to disciplinary matters, Dr. Langen admits the justness of Hippolytus' case against Callistus more fully than Dr. Döllinger. Callistus, he thinks, did undoubtedly effect a complete and dangerous revolution in the discipline of the Roman Church¹ (p. 258).

And who was Hippolytus? A bishop, as Eusebius and Jerome knew, and as he himself in the newly-discovered 'Refutatio' implies. But bishop of what see? Eusebius and Jerome knew not. A late legend had made him Bishop of Portus, a subordinate of the See of Rome; but this theory, though patronized by Bishop Wordsworth, who is anxious to

¹ Dr. Langen even admits the probability of Callistus having patronized the practice of re-baptism and introduced it into the Roman Church (p. 257, note 1). This, however, seems, in view of Pope Stephen's statements thirty years later about the tradition of his Church, quite impossible.

remove anything discreditable from the fair fame of Hippolytus, may be said to have been overthrown by Dr. Döllinger. There would seem little room for doubt that Hippolytus allowed himself to be carried so far in his opposition to Callistus as to allow himself to create a schism in the Church of Rome, as Novatian did somewhat later; he was for a while a schismatic Bishop of Rome—the first Antipope. The schism seems to have endured as late as the year 235, when it may be accepted as history that Hippolytus was banished with Bishop Pontian to Sardinia.¹

Through the breach, then, in the cloud which shrouds the history of the Church of Rome in the first half of the third century, we discern not indeed a vile heresiarch on the See of Rome denounced by his orthodox suffragan, as Bishop Wordsworth would present the picture to us, but a Bishop of Rome representing at least a very dangerous theology and a very lax and revolutionary tendency in discipline, and a theologian of good reputation appearing in the ambiguous position of rival and schismatical Bishop of Rome. A strange and unexpected picture! This, at least, it emphasizes to us: how little the œcumenical reputation of a theologian of this age of the Church was affected by his relation of open hostility to the accepted Bishops of Rome.

The theological laxity of the Bishop of Rome at this period is in marked contrast to the dogmatic determinateness of the theological utterance of Pope S. Dionysius towards the end of the century (pp. 355–357, Langen). All taint of Sabellianism has, at any rate, vanished from the See of Rome in the interval. When Dionysius of Alexandria gives occasion to the faithful to doubt his orthodoxy on the proper Divinity of the Son, Dionysius of Rome is appealed to by the orthodox, and in his reply gives an elaborate exposition of the Trinitarian faith, to which is assigned by Dr. Langen the immense credit of first indicating the true mean in formulating the doctrine of the Trinity between Sabellianism and Subordinationism.

There is a great deal in Professor Langen's work of which we cannot give even a sketch. We must ignore, for example,

¹ Langen differs on details connected with the end of the schism and the death of Hippolytus from Döllinger. See pp. 230 and 268. Dr. Salmon (*Dic. of Christian Biog.* vol. iii. pp. 90, 91) has a suggestion, which is at least interesting, that Hippolytus as 'ἐθνῶν ἐπισκοπος,' i.e. (possibly) assistant bishop of foreign Christians at Rome, may have had episcopal consecration prior to the schism. This would make the whole transaction much less incredible.

188
his
Ro
at
cla
Ch
inv
Lan
the
In
bite
the
spe
Chu
the
Bish
that
of th
(
thru
Emp
dual
and
tion,
auth
look
orga
Chris
Rom
of th
the d
Rom
the f
1 p
ascrib
the gro
with t
work i
and th
602).
2 H
95) as
bury, i
with D
cap. xx
milian
nicate

his discussions of the literary remains of the Church of Rome.¹ What it seems best to do is to notice the results at which he arrives in describing the development of the claims of the Roman Church in their relation to the whole Church.

We start, then, from the self-assertion of the Roman See involved in Stephen's excommunication—for such Professor Langen holds it to have been (p. 327)²—of those portions of the Church who held and practised the rebaptism of heretics. In this we find a reproduction of the temper and tone exhibited by Victor in the preceding century in his treatment of the Quartodecimans, but there is something added now in the special authority claimed for the tradition of the Roman Church, and in the claim which Stephen certainly made as the successor of S. Peter (p. 330). It is, however, to the Bishops of Rome, not of this but of the later fourth century, that we can attribute the more definite advance in the claim of the Roman See.

Circumstances during the fourth and fifth centuries were thrusting greatness upon Rome. The Christianizing of the Empire by Constantine (p. 850), 'involving, as it did gradually in more than one respect, the secularizing of the Church and the transference of State-forms to Church organization, had for its consequence the elevation of Roman authority in Church as well as State.' Men were used to look to Rome as the centre of civilization and oecumenical organization, and the identification of the Empire with Christianity helped the tendency to transfer to ecclesiastical Rome the secular prestige. To this we may add that the decay of the Western Empire, after its separation from the East on the death of Theodosius (A.D. 395), and the abandonment of Rome as the seat of the Western Empire at the beginning of the fifth century, left continually more and more of the old

¹ Professor Langen hesitates to accept the general conclusion which ascribes the commentaries of 'Ambrosiaster' to the deacon Hilary, on the ground that the pseudo-Augustinian *Questiones in V. et N. T.* may, with the highest probability, be ascribed to the same author, and this work is by a *Presbyter*. Langen inclines to ascribe both the *Questiones* and the Commentaries to the Luciferian presbyter *Faustinus* (pp. 599-602).

² He characterizes Hefele's strenuous denial of this (*Conciliengesch.* i. 95) as something 'inconceivable' (note 2). The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his article 'Cyprian' (*Dic. of Christian Biog.*), is not altogether with Dr. Langen in this, nor, according to Augustine (*De Baptismo*, lib. v. cap. xxv. § 36), did a separation actually occur; but the letter of S. Ferimilian would certainly imply that Stephen intended actually to excommunicate all the rebaptizing party.

imperial Roman dignity to become the inheritance of the Roman Church.

Again, the circumstances of the Church, no less than those of the Empire, favoured the elevation of the See of Rome. She was remote from all the theological disputes which harassed and dissipated the East. She stood aloof from the violence and heat of the discussion in dignified repose, attracting appellants from all sides who did her honour. 'Circumstances,' then, we say, were thrusting greatness on the See of Rome. There is a Divine Providence in circumstances, and it would seem impossible to doubt that the Providence of God intended for the See of Rome a unique position among the Churches of the world; but what seems equally to be written in history is that, not resting satisfied with the splendid opportunities which God gave her, she used those opportunities in such spirit of self-asserting arrogance as made her reckless of historic truth, reckless of equity and justice, where her own claims were in question.

The temper which from first to last in the epoch of her aggrandisement characterized the See of Rome and is identified with her exaltation is not—we feel on absolutely safe ground in saying this—is not, cannot be, a temper which has the blessing upon it of the God of truthfulness, of equity, of mercy. As surely as history presents us with a Divine purpose for the See of Rome, so surely the conviction is forced upon us that the actual development of the Roman power is a record of the way in which the Divine purpose is parodied and distorted by unfaithfulness.

Dr. Langen takes the epoch of Damasus and Siricius as representing the beginning of a new development in the Roman claim. Siricius, in his reply to the Spanish bishops, dated February 11, 385, which Dr. Langen characterizes as the 'first Papal Decretal' (p. 611), proclaims himself unmistakably in the character of an 'Oberbischof' of the Universal Church. 'He writes his decree with full feeling of Papal authority' (p. 617). The claim of this authority is yet beginning: perhaps it is now made for the first time, but made it certainly is. That Siricius asserts a Papal supremacy over the whole Church is undeniable. The zeal for the Christian religion belongs especially to him who, as Peter's successor, has to care for the whole Church. The Roman See is the Apostolic Rock upon which Christ built His Church (p. 617).¹

¹ The remarks (p. 618) on Siricius' doctrine of the invalidity of confirmation administered by heretics are interesting.

dev
aut
cen
the
dec
pos
dra
in
imm
ind
Div
disc
of K

It s
trad
artic
par
spee
of th
of it
the
Coun
stan
or th
hono
more
Chur
Coun
own
of Pe
force
Leg
the m
work
cepti
T
to th

¹ I
ject of
any ex
² I
critica
S. Pet

This claim which Siricius promulgates receives a new development in the doctrine of Innocent on the teaching authority of the Church of Rome. Rome is, in Innocent's reply to the African Bishops (p. 736), the source of the final confirmation and authority of all ecclesiastical decisions. In the Roman See are '*arcana*'—a secret deposit of Divine tradition on which the faithful are to draw for their decisions as to what judgment is to be passed in doubtful matters (p. 737). The Roman See has thus immanent in herself—if we may so speak, through the indwelling of Peter in his successors—a perpetual spring of Divine tradition and the perpetual authority of universal discipline. To this the *præ*-Leonine claim of the Bishops of Rome amounts.

This claim is Roman, not Catholic; local, not universal. It springs up and grows in complete independence of the traditions of the Eastern Church. If it is essential to an article of the Christian faith that it should be part and parcel of the Christian development everywhere, then the special prerogative of the Roman See is not of the essence of the Christian faith, for Eastern Christianity knew nothing of it. Professor Langen shows us how completely alien from the conceptions of the Eastern Church at the period of the Council of Nicæa is the thought that the Roman Church stands in any special relation to the tradition of the faith or the government of the Church.¹ She has her primacy of honour in her own region. This is recognized, and nothing more. Indeed, from the fifth century onward, the Roman Church has never liked the simple history of the Nicene Council. She interpolated at an early date a clause about her own primacy into its sixth canon. She quoted by the mouth of Pope after Pope, in spite of all evidence to the contrary forced upon her, the Canons of Sardica as of Nicene authority. Legend has been busy with the Council of Nicæa. If we read the narrative of it in the pages of a modern Ultramontane work,² the result is enough to astonish anyone with any conception of what history means.

This ignoring of any special relation of the See of Rome to the truth of the Church is very obvious in the case of

¹ Professor Langen, summing up the conflicting evidence on the subject of the presidency of the First General Council, thinks the question is in any exact sense beyond solution (p. 409).

² It is, for example, a saddening but instructive task to examine critically the page about the Council of Nicæa in Mr. Allies' '*See of S. Peter*,' p. 155, 3rd edition.

S. Athanasius.¹ Whether he looks back to the past, and is defending the orthodoxy of his predecessor Dionysius, who made his apology to his contemporary and namesake the Bishop of Rome, or is speaking of the Roman Bishops of his own time, he seems to know nothing of any doctrinal authority in their See. When Liberius fell away from the authority of the Nicene Council, repudiated Athanasius, and signed a compromising creed, Athanasius' kindly apology for him is couched in a tone which he could not possibly have used had the collapse of the Roman Bishop, and his desertion of the orthodox standpoint, been any special shock to the mind of the great champion of the imperilled truth.² It is true that Easterns from time to time in appealing to Rome for protection use language more acceptable to Roman ears,³ but it is not the way with appellants to measure their language in addressing their patrons;⁴ and when the Eastern Church acts in corporate capacity, it shows what sort of primacy it recognizes in the Roman See—a primacy of honour grounded especially on imperial position, and none other. Otherwise the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon could not have spoken as they did—

'The Fathers properly gave the primacy to old Rome, because it was the imperial city, and the 150 bishops (at Constantinople) being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, judging with reason that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and enjoyed equal privilege with the elder Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her.'

So spoke the Fathers of Chalcedon. Could words suggest a more complete ignoring of any special doctrinal and disciplinary position in the See of Rome? We have voluminous works of S. Chrysostom. We have his Commentary on our Lord's words to S. Peter, 'On this rock I will build my Church.' Is not his silence suggestive of just this same ignoring of Roman claims? He either does not know them or does not notice them.⁵ Eastern Christianity in its whole growth and fabric is independent of Rome.⁶

Dr. Langen devotes some careful pages to the Council of

¹ Langen, p. 450.

² P. 479.

³ P. 851.

⁴ Langen, p. 809, shows the *motive* apparent in some language of S. Cyril's.

⁵ See Langen, p. 683, on his appeal to Rome.

⁶ Dr. Langen points out that the Council of Constantinople represents to a certain extent not merely independence of Rome but antagonism to her (p. 560).

Eph
Th
whil
diffe
cent
with
grea
mak
on t
silen
The
and
of M
arriv
most

I
with
towa
there
the S
with
with
thoug
purpo
the f
any V
Bisho
was t
of Ro
B
cant.
quote
of pa
ment
logica
emoti
securi
throw
The c
'Who

¹ P.
harmo
² L.
about t
³ S.

Ephesus and the position of the Roman See in relation to it. The point which seems to emerge in this Council is that while (1) the See of Rome occupies now an altogether different position to that which it occupied in the fourth century, and (2) the alliance of Cyril, from various motives,¹ with Rome brought Rome to the fore in connexion with the great champion of orthodoxy, and gave her an opportunity of making her claims of doctrinal authority heard in the East, on the other hand the Eastern Bishops are no more than silent. They give no kind of recognition to Roman claims. The faith is decided on the old basis of oecumenical consent, and Vincent of Lerins² takes the procedure of the Council of Ephesus as the current example of that method of arriving at the truth through *consent of East and West* which most rapidly disposes of Papal claims.

It remains to notice the last chapter of this book, dealing with the attitude of the great Western and African teachers towards the Roman Church. In the language of Ambrose there is not much special significance. His reverence towards the See of Rome indeed is well known. He takes communion with the Church of Rome on one occasion (p. 852) as identical with communion with the Catholic Church; but this language, though it admits of being easily used for a controversial purpose, involves no theory, involves indeed nothing beyond the fact that the best practical test by which a stranger in any Western district could make it clear to himself that any Bishop was a Catholic, and not a Luciferian or other schismatic, was to ask him whether he was in communion with the See of Rome.

But the language of S. Jerome is fuller and more significant. Jerome, in this as in many controversies, may be quoted on both sides. He was a man in whom the merging of passion and reason produces a result in the way of argument more surprising sometimes than satisfying. His vigorous logical powers were too often at the service of the strongest emotion. When amidst the turmoil of the East he feels the security and dogmatic repose of the Roman Church, he throws himself with warmth and eagerness into her cause. The communion of Rome is the communion of the Church. 'Who eats the lamb outside this house is profane.'³ Often,

¹ P. 824, on Cyril's jealousy of Constantinople throwing him into harmony with the aims of Rome.

² Langen, p. 826, note 1. We wonder Dr. Langen has not said more about the *rule of faith* as formulated by Vincent of Lerins.

³ See p. 535. Dr. Langen attempts to throw doubt upon the meaning

again, Jerome takes the faith of the Church of Rome as the safe antithesis to Origenistic tendencies. Indeed, it would not be strange if a man like Jerome, associated as closely as he was with an actual Bishop of Rome, had thrown himself for good and all into the extreme Roman tendency. As a fact, however, when Jerome finds himself in opposition to an actual tendency of the Roman Church, he makes short and contemptuous work with her authority. The deacons of Rome pleaded this authority for their exaltation of the third order to what Jerome thought an unseemly height. What is the Roman Church, then, Jerome demands, which the other Churches are not (p. 855)? If it is a question of authority, *the world is greater than a city*. Wherever a bishop is, be it at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, he has the same worth (*eiusdem meriti est*), the same priesthood. Riches or poverty make no bishops higher or lower. . . . The customs of Rome are only those of one city. No words, as Dr. Langen remarks, can contradict the Papal system more directly than these. It is nothing less than dishonest to quote Jerome's utterances about the See of Rome in one tone without quoting them in the other also.

A special and peculiar interest attaches to the theory of the Roman See which developed itself in the African Church. This shall be the last point to which we will call attention.

We attribute to S. Cyprian specially the formulation of the doctrine of Church Unity as finding its embodiment and certificate in the Episcopate. Each duly-ordained bishop is to S. Cyprian the inheritor of the full power and authority of that episcopate, which exists one and indivisible, deriving from the one Spirit, in the Church. To each bishop is intrusted the full exercise of this authority, and, as Cyprian formulates his doctrine, he makes the individual bishop responsible to none over him except God. The individual canonical bishop has the whole in himself, just as each Apostle had in himself the fullness of Apostolic authority. The importance which Cyprian assigned to the preservation of visible communion amongst bishops makes it plain that he must have been ready to admit that this theory would require modification in statement and practice; but in his relations to the Bishop of Rome in the matter of Rebaptism,

of these words; not, we think, with success. On the next page he says this passage is (note 1) the only exception (if it be so) to the generalization that in Patristic literature the *See of Peter* is never called the Foundation of the Church. He, however, himself (p. 617) chronicles another exception in 'the first Papal decree.'

in re
auth
inde

T

which

of R

pecu

anyth

to all

has a

the

Peter

as the

In a

succ

Rome

capac

See o

when

origin

T

sized

the D

specia

capac

'The

eccles

sors th

after

unity

Optat

sion in

Peter

as bou

everyv

another

repres

Ghost,

profan

age.³

¹ See

² On

credited

³ See

with Gro

in repudiating what he considered his arrogant assertion of authority, S. Cyprian emphasizes his conception of the full independence and essential equality of each Bishop.¹

There is still place, however, left for the peculiar honour which attaches to the Church and See of Rome. The Bishop of Rome is the successor of S. Peter, and S. Peter occupied a peculiar position among the Apostles. Not that he had anything which the others had not, but that which was given to all was first given to him as a *symbol of unity*. S. Peter has a representative function: he represents in his single self the Apostolic and therefore the Episcopal commission. S. Peter is therefore, symbolically, the predecessor of all bishops, as the first representative holder of the Episcopal commission. In a sense, all bishops inherit his commission and are his successors, but in a special sense this is true of the Bishops of Rome. Thus, something of the symbolic and representative capacity of S. Peter belongs to the Bishops of Rome. The See of Rome S. Cyprian speaks of as the '*ecclesia principalis*,' whence, in the person of Peter, the Episcopal unity had its origin.²

This peculiar position of the Church of Rome is emphasized again in the writings of S. Optatus of Milevis against the Donatists. This Church gains a dignity from being, in a special sense, that 'See of Peter' which, in its representative capacity, is *the one Episcopal see* in which all bishops share. 'The See of Peter,' Dr. Langen says (p. 858), 'is the one ecclesiastical see in which all the Apostles and their successors the bishops in equal measure participate, which is called after Peter, because he first (to emphasize symbolically the unity of the Church) was put in possession of it.' Thus Optatus speaks distinctly of the legitimate Episcopal succession in *Africa* as the *See of Peter*, the 'See of Cyprian or Peter.' Catholic bishops, as a whole, again, are spoken of as bound by succession to Peter. The See of Peter is present everywhere in the Episcopate; it is the only see; just as in another passage the Seven Churches of Asia are, in their representative capacity, the only Churches who have the Holy Ghost, and what is not in communion with them is declared profane, because they represent the Church of the Apostolic age.³ It is in this sense that to be one with the See of Peter

¹ See Langen, § xxiii. pp. 333 *seq.*

² On the words which have occasioned S. Cyprian, of all men, to be credited with holding Papal Infallibility, see Langen, p. 341.

³ See especially *De Schism. Don.* ii. 6; and of the necessity of union with Greek Churches, vi. 3.

is an essential of Church life, or, as is still more distinctly stated, the Catholic Church *has only one See*. 'The sees of all Churches are, all equally, different representatives of the one ideal see' (p. 859): all equally in essence, only a special dignity belongs to the See of Rome as, in a special sense as well as in the general, 'the See of Peter,' and the see which therefore comes naturally to hand as the symbol of present unity.

Again in Augustine, the greatest of African teachers, reappears this peculiar position assigned to the See of Rome as special representative of that See of Peter which, in its essence, is present in each Episcopate. It is difficult sometimes to be sure whether S. Augustine is speaking of the Episcopate as a whole as succeeding to Peter, or of the Bishops of Rome in particular. When he bids the Donatists 'reckon the bishops from the very See of Peter, and in that array of Fathers consider the succession of one to another,' because 'this see is the rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not,' he seems to be speaking unmistakably of *all* the bishops as the successors of Peter (p. 868), though no doubt a specially representative position is naturally conceived to inhere in the 'See of Peter' in Rome, as in the Apostle himself in the Apostolic College.

And thus we approach a question with which we propose briefly to deal, in reference to S. Augustine and this African conception of the See of S. Peter: and here, for the moment, we leave the ground covered by Professor Langen. Does not, it may be asked, the assignment of this representative function to the See of Rome make union with Rome an essential of unity with the Church? Would not S. Augustine practically make the sin of schism to consist in breaking off from that visible Church communion which finds its representative centre in the See of Rome?

This question may be answered thus. It is quite true that S. Augustine does lay immense stress on Catholic communion: on the free union of intercourse between different parts of the Church. He does not seem in arguing with the Donatists to contemplate the case of a divided Church in which each branch, though divided from the others, will yet remain part of the one Church, essentially one in the unity of its life, underlying all outward divisions.¹ He does not dis-

¹ See, however, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, cap. xiii. § 33, on the division of Judah and Israel. There is, moreover, no specification of Rome as the centre of union. The main stress is laid on the *universality* of the Church as against Donatist exclusiveness.

tinguish accurately between the 'unity of the Spirit' and 'the bond of peace.' S. Augustine, we admit, then does not contemplate breaches of external communion in the Church. That is, he was not prophetic. But neither does S. Augustine contemplate any part of the Catholic Church perishing before the end. He does not seem to believe it possible that where the Catholic Church has been founded in any part of the world it can vanish away. The divisions of the Church no more contradict the Augustinian theory of Church unity than the Mohammedan conquests contradict his theory of Church perpetuity.¹ Essentially S. Augustine's theory of Church unity is the same as S. Cyprian's—a unity not of external government, but of transmitted life; and this real identity of Augustine's and Cyprian's conception of Church unity leads us to notice the identity of Augustine's and Cyprian's conception of Church authority and the sin of schism. If there is any book which is antipapal in its conception of Church authority and which throws the charge of schism back upon the Roman Church itself, it is S. Augustine's work *De Baptismo*. S. Augustine there, in arguing with the Donatists, is at pains to make a clear distinction between S. Cyprian's position, in holding to Rebaptism as firmly as he did, and theirs. In S. Cyprian it is blameless: blameless, though, as we know, he had, in adhering to his judgment and the judgment of the African Church, to repudiate utterly the authority of the Bishop of Rome. Yet S. Cyprian was to S. Augustine blameless in the matter, because he did not repudiate the authority of any universal council as the Donatists did. Nothing is superior to a local council, in S. Augustine's theory of Church government, but a universal council; and from this point of view he justifies S. Cyprian's conduct in holding to his own—even though erroneous—opinion and practice (in face though it was of Papal condemnation) till adequate Church authority had been brought to bear upon it.

Once again, S. Augustine makes the sin of schism in the case of the Donatists to consist in their *intolerance*, in which respect he contrasts them with S. Cyprian, that is to say, he holds up S. Cyprian as the pattern of the *unschismatic temper*, because, though he held to the judgment which his local Church had done its best to form in a difficult matter, he did not make the point a condition of communion with others—*there being no universal Church authority in the matter*—but held his own opinion and let others hold theirs. It was a

¹ *De Unit. Eccl.* cap. xvii. §§ 44, 45.

matter of great importance in Cyprian's conception, nothing less than the legitimate administration of baptism, which was at stake; yet he did not go one whit beyond his own rights—he held his own judgment, and let others hold theirs, and kept communion with them as far as in him lay. And this is the unschismatical temper, while the schismatical temper is just that which enforces as the condition of communion with others matters which, right or wrong, fall short of that full Catholic authority which alone justifies the enforcement of opinion as a condition of communion. Has there not, then, we ask, been a good deal of this temper of schism abroad in the Church? and is there any Church in whose history it appears more prominently than in hers who from age to age has made new claims, and in making them has enforced them where she had power to do it, and issued her excommunications on those who would not accept decrees which fell very far short of œcumenical authority? Surely if the temper of schism is the temper which raises opinions which may be tenable, but are not authoritative, into conditions of communion, the Church of Rome has a good deal to answer for in this matter.

This African conception of Church unity and the relation of the See of Rome to it, is the last point with which we have space to deal in our review of Dr. Langen's work. There are many matters of interest which fall within the scope of this book on which we have not even touched. We trust enough has been said to direct the attention of students to a very important book, and indicate the general tendency of its conclusions.

MR
this
fast
Int
are
who
the
aim
sho
we
pag

and
prev
typic
step
taki
their
that
his e
been
mana

I
night
marri
Marf
she w

I
sonag
treasu

A
her h
look
then

ART. III.—FOLK-TALES.

1. *Russian Folk-Tales.* By W. R. S. RALSTON, M.A., &c. (London, 1873.)
2. *Tibetan Tales, derived from Indian Sources.* Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-Gyur. By F. ANTON VON SCHIEFNER. Done into English from the German, with an Introduction, by W. R. S. RALSTON, M.A. (London, 1882.)

MR. RALSTON is a charming storyteller, but he is more than this. He possesses such a familiar acquaintance with the fast growing literature of the subject of this paper, that the Introductions and notes by which his stories are accompanied are full of instruction. To these we must refer the reader who may desire fuller information on that subject than, in the space of a short article, we can furnish. All that we can aim at is to stimulate a little interest in it, and endeavour to show that it is not unworthy of attention. With this view we borrow at the outset the following tale from Mr. Ralston's pages.

There once lived, so runs the story, an old man with his wife and his three daughters. The eldest of these, being the child of a previous marriage, was treated very unkindly by her stepmother, a typical *injusta noverca*. Her life was one of incessant toil, and her stepmother was for ever finding fault with her, while her stepsisters, taking pattern by their mother, were for ever teasing her. It was their delight to make her cry, though she was so good and patient that she did her utmost to be of service to them. The father loved his eldest daughter, and would have made her life happier if he had been able; but he was feeble, his wife was a scold, and he could not manage her daughters.

Now, the wife wanted to get rid of her stepdaughter. So one night she said to her husband, 'I say, old man, let us get Marfa married.' Then she told him to be ready early next morning to take Marfa away in the sledge. The poor girl was made to believe that she was going on a visit—a prospect which delighted her.

It was winter time, and very cold, and Morozko or Frost (a personage not unknown to English readers) had hung his glittering treasures all about.

After breakfast the wife gave the following explicit directions to her husband. 'Drive Marfa to her bridegroom, old man! And look here, old greybeard! drive straight along the road at first, and then turn off from the road on the right, you know, into the forest,

right up to the big pine that stands on the hill, and then hand Marfa over to Frost.'

The old man did not venture to disobey. So on reaching the tall pine-tree in the forest, he set down his daughter, bidding her to wait for the bridegroom, and receive him as pleasantly as she could, and then he drove home.

After Marfa had sat there shivering for some time, her teeth chattering with the cold, suddenly she heard a sound. It was Frost leaping from fir to fir, and snapping his fingers. Soon he was in the tree above her, and he called out, 'Art thou warm, maiden?' She replied, 'Warm, warm am I, dear Father Frost.' Descending lower he asked her again whether she was warm, and she replied as before, though she could scarcely draw her breath for the cold.

At last Frost took pity on her, and wrapped her in furs and blankets.

In the morning the father, coming to see after his daughter, was delighted to find her alive and loaded with costly gifts. But his wife was disappointed to see her return safe and sound. Punishment, however, came upon her. For, thinking to procure the like good fortune for her own daughters, she sent them off to the same spot, and they, out of temper with one another and with all the world, received Frost so ungraciously that he froze them to death.¹

We have here considerably abridged Mr. Ralston's version of a popular Russian folk-tale. In its presentation of winter, the full effect of which naturally suffers in an abridgment, the story differs from most Northern tales. In lands where the horrors of winter are felt in all their stern reality, the imagination loves to dream of sunny scenes.

The story contains also what many folk-tales do not contain—a decidedly didactic element. It has a moral, or rather two or three morals, between whose conflicting claims to be *the* moral there is some difficulty in deciding. We could wish that Mr. Ralston had been able to add to his claim on our gratitude for the story itself by informing us whether it is considered to inculcate any one particular moral lesson, and what that lesson is. The demand for a moral to such a story does not seem satisfied by the point to which he calls attention, and which is illustrated in many popular stories of retributive justice, *viz.* that the murderous intention of the stepmother is punished (in the persons of her own daughters) by the same instrumentality as that on which she reckoned for effecting her criminal purpose. As no authoritative exposition of the parable is forthcoming, we confess to a doubt whether the *motif* is to illustrate the power of a patient and submissive disposition, or to represent unkindness

¹ See *Russian Folk-Tales*, pp. 214-220.

bet
nat
fer
in
Div
Wh
offe
Fro
sinf

stor
wou
is cl
that
the
perh
fami
snow
frost
story
herb
Fros
cold,
ducti
S

Yet
of m
phen
and,
storie
in the

But
signif
the m
refer,
interf
contai
It is i
be dis
wheth
the ot
VOL

between near relations as more malignant than the severest natural forces. In a variation of the story, current in a different part of Russia, the pious submissiveness of the maiden, in this case not only to stern parental authority but to the Divine appointments, is brought into greater prominence. When left by her father, she sits 'trembling and silently offering up a prayer.' And it is her 'wise words' in reply to Frost, 'Welcome, Frost; doubtless God has sent you for my sinful soul,' that turn him into a friend.

Such questionings with regard to the moral apply to the story as it is told in modern times. There are scholars who would point to them, and to the fact that the didactic element is clearer in one variation than in another, in order to prove that this element is an afterthought, a later addition, showing the marks of its growth. If they are right, the story was perhaps in earlier days only a poetical rendering of the familiar fact that vegetation is preserved by the mantle of snow which is produced by, though it tempers the severity of, frost. On this interpretation the furs and blankets in the story represent the covering of snow by which the humbler herbage is protected, while a beautiful bridal veil, one of Frost's costly gifts, is the analogue of some other effect of cold, and the stepsisters would stand for the gay floral productions of the earth that perish on the approach of winter.

Such an interpretation is surely not wanting in grace. Yet to some minds it may appear an unwelcome degradation of moral tales to reduce them to mere descriptions of natural phenomena. The didactic element is first in importance, and, in their view, is generally the foundation of all such stories. They see the *raison d'être* of the narrative element in the fact that

'Truth in closest words shall fail
When truth embodied in a tale
Shall enter in at lowly doors.'

But, on either view, the marvel remains, and is equally significant, that the sensible world is thus capable of being the medium of conveying spiritual and moral truth. We refer, of course, to the fact that, apart from any miraculous interferences with the order of nature, the physical world contains multitudes of analogies to the moral and spiritual. It is immaterial, except as a question of science and one to be discussed on its own merits in each particular instance, whether the resemblance was first seen from the one side or the other. We cannot now pursue this line of thought further

than to remark that on either view the words of Archbishop Trench are equally true: 'Besides His revelation in words, God has another and an elder, and one indeed without which it is inconceivable how that other could be made; for from this it appropriates all its signs of communication.'

If it be true that art, in some of its chief departments, has well-nigh exhausted its resources, it is not true with regard to science. Amongst the older provinces of scientific inquiry some are still calling for new labourers, and promising great results to those who are willing to enlist in the service. For example, though so much has been already accomplished by the Egyptologists, yet a vast number of Egyptian texts remain undeciphered; while the history of the developments of Buddhism is so far from being an accomplished work that the labours of many scholars will be required, Dr. Rhys Davids tells us, for many years to come, only to prepare the materials for it.

Moreover, besides new fields which open from time to time to the view of advancing science, it happens occasionally that familiar ground, hitherto thought barren as regards scientific results, is found worthy of patient cultivation, which it rewards with a harvest of new truths and sometimes of new questions calling for further labour in their investigation. Thus it has come to pass that the mature intellect has turned to the serious investigation of some of the childish things which had been put away by advancing manhood, and science has not disdained to listen attentively to, and analyse, the old wives' fables which beguiled the long hours in the nursery, and to compare them with the marvellous narratives that serve a similar purpose in foreign lands.

Nor only the nursery tales. The narratives to which, under this denomination, most minds would recur, form only a small portion of the vast mass of popular literature known as folk-lore. We must not judge of the property of this kind possessed by other nations by that which may be found amongst ourselves. What may be the reason for the fact we will not take upon ourselves to determine; but, excepting in the limited store of nursery tales, the stream of folk-lore amongst the English peasantry has diminished to a very small volume. Like the taste for music which, in the times conveniently called (*pace* Mr. Freeman) Anglo-Saxon, was almost universal in this country, the capacity to be interested and amused by folk-tales has almost disappeared. Is it that the English have grown less imaginative, or less childish, or that literature of the 'penny dreadful' order has supplanted the

older food for imagination? Or is it that the folk-tale cannot really live without at least some lingering belief in its possible truth, and that credulity has disappeared before the march of education? Have the fairies and the ghouls and the genii gone the way of the graceful creations of the Greek intellect, and vanished along with all the 'fair humanities' of the ancient world, the nymph and the faun, and even Great Pan himself?

The comparative method is the order of the day in many branches of scientific study, and it has been 'productive of valuable results. In regard, indeed, to subjects admitting its application, the knowledge that is obtainable without it is but a very imperfect kind of knowledge. He who knows one language only may be truly said to have no scientific knowledge at all of language. A true insight into the nature of language is only to be obtained by comparing and contrasting several languages.

The method of comparison has elevated the fairy tale and all its relatives from the level of mere childish amusement to the rank of a scientific subject. So long as Jack the Giant-Killer or Cinderella or Puss in Boots were known only as belonging to the nursery literature of English homes, the scholar and the philosopher might well be excused for deeming them unworthy of serious attention. But one of the first discoveries of placing side by side the popular tales of divers countries is that many of the imaginary personages best known to the English child are heroes or heroines of almost world-wide celebrity. Even the differences in several versions of the same story current in different countries are often instructive. The local colouring is found to illustrate the character and the condition of the people amongst whom it is found.

The vitality of some portions of folk-lore is marvellous. And this remark applies not only to set histories, such as those of the personages just named, but even to pieces more trivial and apparently more fugitive. Is any one of our readers unacquainted with the refractory pig, to stimulate whose movements a whole series of causes and effects was required? The cumulative repetition exhibited in this story—a very ancient artifice in aid of memory, and one very freely employed in the sacred books of the Buddhists—helps no doubt to explain its continued transmission among English-speaking peoples. But its wide dissemination is extraordinary. Nor is it a peculiar possession of our own. In an Italian version which occurs to us the story is the same in the main, with one

chief exception. The machinery is much the same, and there is the same repetition, 'Water, water, quench fire! fire, fire, burn stick,' &c. The purpose, however, for which all the machinery is set in motion is to induce a refractory and ill-tempered boy to eat the portion of macaroni which his mother has left for him.

The discovery of the wide dissemination of many folk-tales gives rise, as we have hinted already, to various questions, in answering which scholars are not agreed. How, for example, did the stories originate? What was their original meaning or intention? Were they devised as parables of life, the purpose of them being to convey wholesome instruction in a pleasant form? Or shall we say with some teachers that they grew up, without any such intention, out of the metaphorical language by which in the remote past the phenomena of nature were described? Was the tale of Cinderella, for instance, designed to show the hatefulness of superciliousness and the merit of humility and serviceableness, or does it only represent some one of the glorious transformations effected by nature in the physical world?

Again, how is the existence to be explained of a body of fable common to East and West? We have learnt that the language spoken by the ancestors of most European peoples and by the ancestors of ancient Indians and Persians was one and the same. Subject to modifications which follow well-ascertained laws, the words in most familiar use, such as father, mother, brother, son, daughter, the names of some domestic animals, the numerals from one to a hundred, and the roots of most words expressing action and even of those expressing quality, are identical in all the Indo-European languages. Some scholars are of opinion that the history of fable resembles that of language, and that the germ at least of many fables already existed before the Aryan or Indo-European tribes were separated. Another view, for which there is much to be said, is that the far East, and particularly India, was the nursery in which the fables were developed, and from whence they found their way by various channels to the western world. The advocates of this view point to such means of communication as pilgrims, merchants, crusaders, the Mohammedan conquerors of Spain, the Tartars of Russia.

That many fables have travelled we cannot doubt, but it is remarkable what a home-grown air some widely diffused stories have. Who did not hear in his younger days of the simpleton who on his way across country saw the Thames for the first time in his life, and patiently waited for all the water

to run away? Who did not fancy he knew the very county in which this rustic was born? Who was not surprised in his school days to find, on reading in his Horace

'Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis,'

that the Roman poet was as familiar with the story as himself?

Some countries, however, are richer in folk-lore than others. Russia, for example, would appear to offer a congenial soil for it, a fact which is perhaps not surprising when we consider the difficulty of carrying out a general system of popular education amongst the sparsely scattered inhabitants of so vast a territory. Whatever the explanation, the folk-tale, according to Mr. Ralston, is characteristic of the Russian people. They, too, have preserved or developed a special aptitude for narrative in which other European Aryans are comparatively deficient. We are naturally more inclined to associate histrionic talent with the peoples of the south, but Mr. Ralston tells us that 'a taste for acting is widely spread in Russia and the Russian folk-tales are full of dramatic positions which offer a wide scope for a display of their reciters' mimetic talents.' The narratives themselves are remarkable likewise for their simple directness and the excellence of their descriptive portions. We commenced this paper with a story which, more especially in the unabridged form, exhibits these qualities in a high degree. In the following story, which Mr. Ralston considers one of the best folk-tales he knows, the same qualities are seen in the presentation of supernatural effects. The Baba Yaga that figures in it is one of the chief of the malignant powers that belong to the world of Russian folk-lore. Were it not that our modern associations with the word 'witch' render it too feeble a title, and moreover that Russian folk-lore boasts of another female being to whom the title more strictly belongs, who, however, closely resembles the Baba Yaga in disposition and in behaviour, so much so that their parts are interchanged in various versions of the same stories, we should be disposed to call her The Witch. Since Shakespeare's time, however, this word has been too generally employed to denote certain withered specimens of, helpless humanity who in remote villages have been objects and sometimes subjects of superstition.¹

¹ The 'witch,' the 'white witch,' and the 'cunning man,' have not yet entirely disappeared from England. Many a west-country clergyman could tell strange tales in illustration of such lingering superstitions.

The story is too long to be given here in full. We will however endeavour to give the reader as fair a taste of its quality as condensation and occasional quotation will allow.

Vasilissa the Fair, like the heroine of our first story and of so many others, is condemned to live with a spiteful stepmother and her two daughters. The latter were not even her half-sisters. For his second wife her father had chosen a widow with two daughters of her own, just about the same age as Vasilissa, thinking that 'she must needs be both a good housekeeper and an experienced mother. But he had deceived himself; for he did not find in her a kind mother for his Vasilissa.'

We pause to remark that in many tales which have travelled in Christian times to the West from countries where polygamy was practised, the stepmother stands in the modern version for the elder and jealous wife who hates the offspring of her rival.¹

Vasilissa's stepmother and stepsisters were jealous of her beauty, and 'tormented her with every possible sort of toil in order that she might grow thin from overwork and be tanned by the sun and the wind. But she bore everything with resignation' and, wonderful to say, continued to increase in beauty, while her enemies grew plainer and plainer 'from the effects of their own spite, notwithstanding that they always sat with folded hands like ladies.'

'But how did that come about? Why, it was her doll that helped Vasilissa. If it hadn't been for it, however could the girl have got through all her work?'

A word of explanation is necessary here. Dolls or puppets figure, as Mr. Ralston remarks, in various folk-tales. That in the present story has a very marked character, and the simplest explanation of it appears to us to be that it represents religion, or rather the outward embodiment of some object of devotion. The better side of image-worship, that which is alleged in its palliation or justification, is that it assists devotion. But it is easy to see how thoughts, whether consolatory, stimulating, self-reproachful, or otherwise, which arise in the mind when contemplating a sacred image, should be attributed to suggestion on the part of the image itself. The reader is now furnished, we believe, with a key to the story so far as the character and conduct of the heroine is concerned. Much that remains may probably be resolved into a nature-myth, as we shall see later on. But to proceed with the story:—

On her dying bed the mother of Vasilissa, who was then eight years old, had given her this doll, saying 'Listen, Vasilissa dear,

¹ See *Russian Folk-Tales*, p. 82.

remember and obey these last words of mine. I am going to die. And now, together with my parental blessing, I bequeath to you this doll. Keep it always by you, and never show it to anybody ; and whenever any misfortune comes upon you, give the doll food, and ask its advice. When it has fed it will tell you a cure for your troubles.'

In all her troubles Vasilissa had recourse to her doll, which never failed to give her good advice and comfort her in her sorrow. Moreover, it did all her work for her, and even showed her herbs which prevented her from getting sunburnt.

When Vasilissa was grown up she received many offers of marriage, while none came to her stepsisters. This made her stepmother more savage than before. She repulsed the suitors and beat poor Vasilissa.

It happened that Vasilissa's father, who was a merchant, had to go away from home on business for a long time. Thereupon the family removed to a house which stood near a dense forest, in the heart of which was a clearing where was a hut inhabited by a Baba Yaga.

One night Vasilissa was compelled by her cruel relations to start off for the Baba Yaga's to ask for a light. Before starting she went into her little closet, set before the doll a supper which she had provided beforehand, and said 'Now, dolly, feed, and listen to my need ! I'm sent to the Baba Yaga's for a light. The Baba Yaga will eat me !'

The doll fed, and its eyes began to glow just like a couple of candles. 'Never fear, Vasilissa dear !' it said. 'Go where you're sent ; only take care to keep me always by you. As long as I'm with you, no harm will come to you at the Baba Yaga's.'

So Vasilissa got ready, put her doll in her pocket, crossed herself, and went out into the thick forest.

As she walks she trembles. Suddenly a horseman gallops by. He is white, and he is dressed in white, under him is a white horse, and the trappings of the horse are white—and the day begins to break.

She goes a little further, and a second rider gallops by. He is red, dressed in red, and sitting on a red horse—and the sun rises.

Vasilissa went on walking all night and all next day. It was only towards the evening that she reached the clearing on which stood the dwelling of the Baba Yaga. The fence around it was made of dead men's bones ; on the top of the fence were stuck human skulls with eyes in them ; instead of uprights at the gates were men's legs ; instead of bolts were arms ; instead of a lock was a mouth with sharp teeth.

Vasilissa was frightened out of her wits and stood still as if rooted to the ground.

Suddenly there rode past another horseman. He was dressed all in black and on a black horse. He galloped up to the Baba Yaga's gate and disappeared, and night fell. But the darkness did not last long. The eyes of all the skulls on the fence began to shine, and the whole clearing became bright. Vasilissa shuddered with fear, but stopped where she was, not knowing which way to run.

Soon there was heard in the forest a terrible roar. The trees cracked, the dry leaves rustled. Out of the forest came the Baba Yaga, riding in a mortar, urging it on with a pestle, sweeping away her traces with a broom.

The remainder of the story must be given in as few words as possible. The Baba Yaga takes Vasilissa within, promising that if she will stay awhile and do some work she will give her a light, but threatening to eat her if she does not do so. The task set to be done during the absence of the Baba Yaga on the following day is to clear of the seed four quarters of wheat, and to cleanse the courtyard, sweep the room, cook the dinner, and get the linen ready. The Baba Yaga consumed an enormous supper, leaving a few scraps for Vasilissa, and then went to sleep. Not in vain did the girl have recourse to her invaluable monitor, which soothed her fears with the words, 'Never fear, Vasilissa dear! Sup, say your prayers, and go to bed; the morning is wiser than the evening.' In the morning as she looked out of the window the light in the skulls' eyes went out, the white horseman appeared, daylight returned, the Baba Yaga started forth in her strange conveyance, and, the red horseman having appeared, the sun rose.

It is scarcely necessary to say that Vasilissa's task was satisfactorily accomplished before the return of the Yaga. A harder task was set for the next day, but there was no opportunity for the task-mistress to complain when she returned. Vasilissa, being encouraged to speak, ventured to ask about the horsemen whom she had seen, and learnt that they were all the Yaga's trusty servants. Her inquisitiveness extended no further, which was fortunate: 'As to over-inquisitive people,' said the Yaga, 'I eat them.'

Vasilissa's captivity was soon ended. The Yaga drove her out of the house on learning that she was enabled to get through all her task-work because she was assisted 'by her mother's blessing.' Finding her way home by the light of one of the skulls, she was warmly received by her stepmother and stepsisters, who had been entirely destitute of light during her absence. But they were burnt up by the flames that shone forth from the skull.

The conclusion of the story relates how, by the aid of the doll, Vasilissa was enabled to produce needlework of such extraordinary excellence that the king sent for her, and was so struck by her beauty that he made her his wife.¹

What is the meaning of this story? Some readers may be disposed to thrust it aside as meaningless, as mere childish nonsense; but it appears to us to contain much good sense and some deep if mistaken philosophy. The Baba Yaga may well stand for Nature personified, the actual malignity of her character being doubtless due to the influence of Eastern philosophy. It is, however, to be noted that, harsh and cruel as she appears, hard as are the tasks which she

¹ See *Russian Folk-Tales*, pp. 150-158.

exacts, she is harmless to those who possess a certain inner spring of wisdom. Patience, perseverance, and devotion to duty are enabled by supernatural help to surmount difficulties which are apparently insuperable.

That Nature herself is represented by the Baba Yaga seems evident. Who but Nature could be supposed to have the Day, the Sun, and the Night for her 'trusty servants'? Why she should ride in a mortar and sweep away her traces is not indeed quite clear; but there is nothing incongruous in the poetical representation of her as a being who goes abroad at dawn and seeks repose at night, or as a powerful being who destroys the idle and those who are rashly inquisitive, while she grants, if grudgingly, the means of subsistence to the industrious.

One curious result of the modern investigation into the sources of popular tales is to deprive an ancient name of those honours of authorship which during many centuries caused its possessor to be regarded as the type of the fabulist. The world, both ancient and modern, has been familiar with fables which were supposed to have sprung from the inventive genius of *Æsop*, who is said to have lived in the sixth century before Christ. If he left any writings behind him they are not now extant. Whether the fables, the turning of which into verse beguiled the tedium of Socrates' imprisonment, were *Æsop's*, as Plato asserted, we have no means of knowing; but the so-called fables of *Æsop* current in the modern world are none of them really *Æsopian* at all. They all come to us directly either from the collection of fables formed by Planudes, a monk of Constantinople of the fourteenth century, or from still more recent supplementary collections. Planudes was indebted for several of his fables to Babrius, a Greek versifier of the first century before Christ, whose work was also the basis of the collection of fables which Phædrus, the freedman of Augustus, published with respectful mention of *Æsop* as their original author. The work of Babrius had been lost sight of for a long while, only a few fragments of it being known in the Middle Ages; but in 1824 a complete copy was found in the possession of the monks on Mount Athos. Before the time of Planudes many of the Buddhist Birth Stories and other Indian tales were already well known in Europe, and to this source he was largely indebted. It appears even that some fables which are found, not only in Planudes, but also in Phædrus and in Babrius, are of Buddhist origin.

The reduction of such a literary personality as that of

Æsop to a mere *magni nominis umbra* is a remarkable achievement. Not less striking is the proof, apparently irrefutable, of the identity of a canonized saint, whose title to the honour has received the formal recognition of the Papacy, with Gotama the Buddha. Professor Liebrecht had identified Josaphat, the hero of a mediæval religious romance, with Buddha; but it was Professor Max Müller who first pointed out the fact that the founder of Buddhism is represented in the Roman Calendar, though in many of the numerous works based on the story of Josaphat the hero is stated to have been canonized. Dr. Rhys Davids has furnished some additional and important details on the subject.

In the *Martyrologium*, compiled by Cardinal Baronius and authorized by Pope Sixtus V. (1585-1590), are included, under the date of November 27, 'the holy Saints Barlaam and Josaphat, of India, on the borders of Persia, whose wonderful acts Saint John of Damascus has described.'¹ Baronius derived the names from the *Catalogus Sanctorum* drawn up in the fourteenth century by Petrus de Natalibus, who borrowed his account of the two saints from a Latin version of a work in Greek by S. John of Damascus. This work was the romance just mentioned in which the author has made use of materials drawn from the life of Buddha to construct the history of Joasaph or Josaphat, whom he presents to the reader as an Indian prince converted by Barlaam and renouncing the world to become a hermit. Not only are there correspondences between the two lives in regard to various details, but the name Josaphat is proved by comparative philology to be merely a corruption of the word Bodisat, the title borne by Buddha in the *Birth Stories*.² Moreover, in the romance many of the fables and other narratives contained in the book of *Birth Stories* reappear.

But how did S. John of Damascus become acquainted with this Indian literature? The answer is plain. In his earlier days he held high office under the Khalif of Bagdad, at whose court was produced the Arabic version, entitled *Kalilah and Dimnah*, of a work in Ancient Persian, the materials of which were derived from a Buddhistic source.

The romance of Barlaam and Josaphat was composed in

¹ Dr. Rhys Davids gives the reference to 'p. 177 of the edition of 1873, bearing the official approval of Pope Pius IX.'—See *Buddhist Birth Stories* (Translation), vol. i. Introduction.

² These stories purport to relate incidents in Buddha's past lives when he was only on the road to Buddhahood, a Bodisat, or 'one who is about to become a Buddha.'

the e
tion.
Ital
landi
to ha
figur
sugg

T
of fol
ever,
transl
decea
legen
canon
In co
sisting
Tibet
Ralst
and s
memo
table
tunity
that o
peculi
the 'S
purpos
it,'² or
Roma
Roma

Of
and th
counte
legend

¹ Th
² An
Mongol
they ar
Mongol
Tibetan
who wis
monaste
A readi
used to
all the l
Before e
all readi
hours.'

the eighth century, and its popularity and extensive circulation are shown by the fact that it exists in Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, German, English, Swedish, Dutch, and Icelandic. It is not surprising that if the story was supposed to have a foundation in fact, the idea of venerating the central figures of it, whenever or wherever that idea may have first suggested itself, should have met with wide popular approval.

The latest important addition to the accumulating stores of folk-lore comes to us from the far east. It does not, however, come directly, Mr. Ralston's *Tibetan Tales* being a translation by him of the German version by the lately deceased great Russian linguist Professor Schiefner of the legends and tales contained in one portion of the sacred canon of Tibet. Nor are the tales indigenous to that country. In common with the main body of that colossal code, consisting of over three hundred folio volumes, they are merely Tibetan versions of Sanskrit writings. It may be, as Mr. Ralston says, that stories possessing characteristic features and suffused with local colour still possibly live in the memories of the natives of that region of lofty and bleak tablelands, with which so few Europeans have had an opportunity of becoming familiar.¹ But these tales are not of that character. They contain no allusion to those striking peculiarities of Tibetan Buddhism, the 'Praying Wheels' and the 'Trees of the Law,' which are supposed to serve the purpose of devotion while they dispense with the trouble of it,² or to that Lamaism which, even by the confession of Roman ecclesiastics, bears so much resemblance externally to Romanism.

Of the stories before us many are fables about animals, and these as well as some other short narratives have their counterparts in European folk-lore. Some are more properly legends, and these have little more than occasional features in

¹ *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

² An ingenious device for economizing time which is practised by the Mongol Buriates of Russia deserves mention. According to M. Vasilief they are even more devoted to their religion than their kinsmen in Mongolia itself. 'They read their sacred books, or hear them read, in Tibetan, and are edified, even though they do not comprehend. Anyone who wishes to command a reading . . . addresses himself to one of the monasteries, . . . pays a certain price, and provides tea for the Lamas.' A reading of the *Kah-gyur*, which consists of above one hundred volumes, used to cost about fifteen pounds, exclusive of tea. 'At a given signal all the Lamas flock together, and take their places according to seniority. Before each are placed a number of leaves of the work, and off they set, all reading at once, so that the entire performance occupies only a few hours.'—*Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

common with tales current in the West. They will doubtless be useful as illustrating one of the developments of Buddhism, but they are not so diverting as the Russian tales, and their moral teaching is by no means uniformly good. They are, however, not wanting in inventiveness. The story, for example, of 'Prince Jivaka, King of the Physicians,' contains several ingeniously devised illustrations of the remarkable astuteness of that personage, though here and there some resemblances may be found elsewhere to the disorders or to the method of cure of which the legend treats. When a man is tormented by pains in the ear in consequence of a centipede having crept in and therein given birth to seven hundred young ones, perhaps no easier cure can be devised than that by which Jivaka earned the gratitude of a patient thus afflicted.

'He said to the man, "Go and make a hut out of foliage, carpet it with blue stuff, place a drum underneath, and make the ground warm." The man provided everything as he was told. Then Jivaka made the man lie down, sprinkled the ground with water, and beat the drum. Thereupon the centipede, thinking that the summer was come, crept out. Then Jivaka placed a piece of meat on the ear. The reptile turned back, but presently came out again with its young ones, and they all laid hold of the piece of meat. Whereupon Jivaka flung it into the flesh pot, and the man recovered his health.'¹

This method of cure was a decided improvement upon that which Jivaka had seen his instructor employ in a case of cerebral malady arising from a similar cause, and which required as a preliminary that the skull of the patient should be laid open. Inasmuch, too, as the operation was painless, and left no ill effects, it certainly is to be preferred to that which is related of a certain English country clergyman, who, it is said, could obtain no rest from headaches, till at last he induced the village blacksmith to hit him on the head with his largest hammer. The patient's skull cracked beneath the blow, and out came sufficient swarms of earwigs to account for his complaint. This story, however, as Mr. Ralston remarks, requires verification.² But Jivaka, as appears from the account of another cure effected by him, could perform a surgical operation on the head without inflicting any pain upon the patient, without even the consciousness on his part that the operation was being performed. We are not informed how the anæsthesia was induced, unless the five hundred jugs of water poured on to the seat of the disorder, both before and after the appli-

¹ See *Tibetan Tales*, p. 103.

² See *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

cation of the surgical instrument, may be held sufficient to account for any amount of insensibility. Seriously, it is interesting to observe how literally modern science, by the discovery of the beneficent action of anæsthetics, has realized one of the wildest dreams of the ancient world. When in the story the patient, after the operation was all over, called upon the physician to begin his work, he actually anticipated a frequent experience of modern times.

The last of the anecdotes told of Jivaka bears some resemblance, not indeed as to detail, but in regard to the leading idea of the method of cure, to stories current elsewhere. The idea is that of a patient being roused somehow or another into a tremendous rage, and in consequence making some violent exertion which proves beneficial to him. In the story before us the invalid, who is no less a personage than the king himself, is suffering from an internal tumour. Jivaka, being charged with its removal, reflects that either excessive joy or excessive wrath might disperse it. He concludes that it is necessary at all risks to excite in his patient excessive wrath, because—the words are very remarkable—‘it would be impossible to arouse excessive joy within so sinful a man.’ Accordingly he devises the means of inflaming the king’s rage, and a perfect cure is the result.¹

We cannot close this paper without a word of admiration for the self-sacrificing life of the scholar whose labours opened the way to the acquisition by Western scholars of the Tibetan language, previously thought, as Dr. Malan says, almost mythical. The story of Csoma de Körös deserves to rank with those of the great discoverers. His self-devotion, his patience, his power of endurance, and his death as a martyr to the cause of knowledge will bear comparison with those of Livingstone.

A native of Hungary, born about 1790, he set himself, under the influence of a philological error, to the task, now known to be impossible, of discovering the ancient home of his ancestors in Eastern Asia. There he expected to find, says Professor Arminius Vámbéry, a people speaking his own language and closely connected with his own nation. ‘Where are you going?’ De Körös was asked at the outset of his travels, by a fellow-countryman whose house he was passing, ‘clad in a thin yellow nankin dress, with a stick in his hand, and a small bundle.’ ‘I am going to Asia in search of our relatives,’ was the reply. ‘And thus,’ continues the Professor, ‘he really went, undergoing, as may easily be conceived, all

¹ See *Tibetan Tales*, p. 107 seq.

the hardships and privations of a traveller destitute of means, living upon alms, and exposed besides to the bitter deception of not having found the looked-for relatives.'

De Körös started on his travels New Year's Day 1820, and he died at Darjeeling, in Nepal, April 11, 1842. A considerable portion of the interval between 1820 and 1832 was spent by him in studying, with the aid of a Lama, the Tibetan literature in the monasteries of that country, living in the poorest possible manner. He left no record of his sojourn in the monasteries, but the glimpses afforded of his life will give some idea of his patience and devotion. At one time, the thermometer being below zero for more than four months, he was confined by the severity of the weather to a room nine feet square. Yet he managed to read from morning to evening without a fire, and 'collected and arranged forty thousand words in the language of Tibet, and nearly completed his Dictionary and Grammar.' These works were brought out at Calcutta, where several of the following years were spent, and where he held for a time the post of assistant-librarian to the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

But what had become of his original purpose? Though he never relinquished the hope of one day penetrating to the ancient ancestral home which he believed to be on the northern confines of China, it would seem that on finding an important and practical work—that of opening up the way into the mysteries of Tibetan literature—offered to his hand, he bent his energies to this, while reserving the other as a future triumph. It was with the hope of making new and great discoveries of Tibetan literature that he left Calcutta in 1842 with the view of revisiting Tibet and making his way further east. This hope was never realized. He was attacked by fever on April 6, and died within a week, a victim, as Professor Max Müller has said, 'to his heroic devotion to the study of ancient languages and religions.' A monument was erected above his remains by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and his grave has since been placed by the Indian Government under the care for ever of the British Resident for the time being at Darjeeling.¹

¹ See *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

AN

The

WH
tury
as a
and
and
deal
Chri
want
epoch
supre
too m
dated
many
mom
tinue
by fr
certa
by pa
cause
that
stran
Engl
solid
days.
Hook
said t
the m
sional
half a
a gre
who v
and c
ticular
works
been

ART. IV.—DR. FARRAR'S 'EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.'

The Early Days of Christianity. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., Canon of Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 2 vols. (London, 1882.)

WHEN the ecclesiastical history of the last quarter of a century comes to be written it will, we suppose, be characterized as a period singularly defective in works of dogmatic theology and even polemic or partisan treatises of permanent weight and moment, while it has been singularly fertile in books dealing with the text and exegesis of Holy Scripture and Christian evidences. Not that our own times have been wanting in stirring debates and even great and momentous epochs. On the Continent the historian will chronicle the supreme crisis of the Vatican Council, from which it is not too much to say that a new period of Church history must be dated. The Protestant communions of France and Germany have been disturbed by internal dissensions of no slight moment; while the Church of England has experienced continued attacks from political dissent outside, has been weakened by frequent small defections Romewards, especially among certain classes of her children, and has been disturbed within by party controversies rivalling in the anxiety that they have caused, if not in the bitterness of their personal animosity, any that have previously strained the union of her members. But, strange to say, neither in Italy, in France, in Germany, or in England have these discussions and disturbances produced a solid mass of argument to rival the great works of former days. No Bellarmine or Bossuet, no Luther or Calvin, no Hooker or Pearson, has appeared in the Church. It may be said that life moves nowadays too rapidly; that the pamphlet, the newspaper or review, the apologetic lecture, the occasional sermon, are more fitted to our time. But this is only half an explanation. No doubt popular taste encourages a great deal of fugitive writing. But in former days those who wrote for the moment could also produce a powerful and consistent body of thought. Nay, this is perhaps particularly true of those who in our own day have composed works of permanent value. To speak of those who have been recently taken from us: writing pamphlets, tracts, or

reviews did not hinder men like Dr. Pusey and Dr. Mozley from the composition of books that will endure the test of time. But they, too, seem to us exceptions that prove the rule. Even men of such astonishing learning and activity of mind as Dr. Pusey, of such acute and broad intelligence as Dr. Mozley, have failed to produce first-rate books of dogmatic theology or even polemics. The *Eirenicon*, though polemic enough to be likened by its recipient to an olive-branch shot from a catapult, was not polemic in intention; and its author recoiled from the task which the Vatican Decrees seemed to throw upon him. Dr. Pusey, if we mistake not, will live as an author rather in his Sermons, his Commentary on the Minor Prophets, and his Lectures on Daniel, than in his more purely dogmatic or controversial treatises. Dr. Mozley was confessedly an apologist, and, as such, will rank very high among English theologians. Even his books on Predestination and on Baptism, his most purely dogmatic works, are, to a great extent, an apology for Augustinianism, adapted to meet the stress of a particular controversy. The same thing is true of living writers, such as Dr. Liddon and Dr. Westcott, whose most valuable books, outside the field of exegesis and criticism—the *Divinity of Christ* and the *Gospel of the Resurrection*—are both apologetic in their character.

But if we admit the absence of works profoundly and primarily dogmatic, no one can doubt the great fertility of exegetical and critical literature, especially in England and Germany. To speak only of our own writers in the Church of England, the present generation has seen the completion of two commentaries on the whole Bible—those of Bishop Wordsworth, and the 'Speaker's,' edited by Canon Cook; of two on the whole New Testament—Dean Alford's and that edited by Bishop Ellicott; of special commentaries and textual criticisms by such various writers as Pusey, Lightfoot, Stanley, Jowett, Ellicott, Burgon, Scrivener, Kay, Perowne, Vaughan, Plumptre, Cheyne, Sanday, and a host of others. It has seen the text of Westcott and Hort brought to publication and its principles elaborately explained, a text which has, *at least*, the great merits of being based upon a full consideration of the accessible evidence and upon critical principles attained and tested by unwearied study. Above all, it has seen the completion of the Revised Version of the New Testament, which has sold by tens of thousands in all English-speaking lands; and it awaits, at no distant date, the even more important revision of the Old Testament.

Of the writers who have thus given themselves to the study and criticism of the New Testament, Dr. Farrar is not one of the least important. The mere bulk and popularity of his work is a fact of no slight mark. Six thick octavo volumes, containing about 600 pages apiece, have been published by him during the last eight years, entirely upon the New Testament. The *Life of Christ* was published first in 1874, and went through twenty-four editions in two years; it is now in the twenty-ninth edition in its original shape and has appeared in two other more popular forms at a cheaper price. The *Life and Work of St. Paul* was issued first in 1879, and is already in its 19th thousand, besides appearing as a popular serial. The preface to the *Early Days of Christianity* is dated June 7, 1882. By Christmas 1882 it had reached its eighth thousand.

This is a phenomenon to excite attention: it is one, in some respects, almost unique in the world of books, and it is perhaps specially deserving of remark in our own age. Dr. Farrar is no doubt a very eloquent and generally a very perspicuous writer, but he does not spare learning either in his text or his notes. The reader has to familiarize himself with a number of strange words and thoughts, and to make what he can of a great variety of sometimes rather enigmatic quotations and allusions. Nor does he, on the other hand, appeal largely to those destructive tendencies which are supposed to be just now so popular. Setting aside the recurrence of certain commonplaces of reproof and censure—which we could readily spare—and the prominence given to one or two opinions alien from the general mind of Christendom, Dr. Farrar's attitude is practical and conservative rather than critical and negative. He discusses points of debate largely and diffusely; but it is to prove a definite conclusion rather than to leave the reader in uncertainty, and the balance of the conclusion is generally on the conservative side. Dr. Farrar's success then gives us a valuable insight into the general mind of the English reading public, and particularly, we suppose, of the great middle class. We find them ready to read with eagerness anything that makes the New Testament more real to them, not deterred by the size and price of the books which are offered to them, but apparently sincerely anxious to have a complete idea of what the canonical Scriptures have to teach in the language of the present day. Whatever faults we may find with the details or principles of Dr. Farrar's work, he has done a real service to the Church of England by proving this fact so triumphantly.

He has shown that our countrymen beyond the men and women of other nations still love the Bible, and will read it and read about it with an assiduity and zeal that they bestow upon few other books. We say read 'it' as well as 'about it,' because Dr. Farrar's books are largely made up of translations more or less literal from the actual Greek of the New Testament.

This is the first remark that occurs to us on the completion of Dr. Farrar's trilogy. But what shall we say of the character and influence of his teaching? Here we think that there is some disposition amongst critics and critical scholars to undervalue the work that he has done. His faults are just those that offend old-fashioned scholarly orthodoxy and progressive freedom of thought, almost in equal measure. He has well-known and obvious defects of style; he is often redundant in language, profuse in illustration, annoyingly obscure in allusion; he is sometimes over-positive and opinionated on uncertain topics; he is sometimes too vacillating where a positive opinion would be more expedient; he now and then criticizes with some fervour the misdeeds of a particular school or set of interpreters, and at the end offers a solution scarcely distinguishable from that which he has generally censured. He takes advantage of popular prejudice against dogmatism, or whatever it may be, and then becomes dogmatic.

We fear that these defects, together with a certain over-swiftness of execution, and a certain lack of depth and penetration in his theology, will prevent Dr. Farrar's books from retaining the popularity which they have so rapidly acquired. He has not the genius or the inspiration—perhaps no one can have—to recombine the fragments of apostolic preaching, the 'broken pieces' from their separate baskets, into the original loaf which was blessed in the hand of Christ; or, to use another metaphor, Dr. Farrar has a certain many-coloured prismatic brilliancy, he delights us with a variety of broken lights, but he wants the severe concentration of the white and pure light of theology which enables us to see things as they really are. If not exactly 'infelix operis summa,' we feel that he leaves us with a sense of incompleteness; that we want some elements, and, above all, a concentration of those which are put before us; and that another generation will feel the want even more than we do. But we believe that these books, especially perhaps the volumes now before us, will render in the main excellent service, and service which it seems no other writer is able to offer in the same attractive form.

Critics do not always remember that the value of books differs very much according to their subject-matter. What would be dangerous in a book of dogmatics or polemics is comparatively harmless in a book of literary exegesis and history. In reading the latter we are quite satisfied that the author should differ from us (within certain limits) in his theories and hypotheses. He must adopt the way of putting and viewing things which is natural to him, or he could not hold his facts together; and we cannot expect this way to commend itself always to our taste or judgment. But what we look for mainly in books of exegesis and historical theology is a good mass of facts appropriately presented—things new and old picked out of the stores and suggestions of the 'scribes,' and so arranged as to impress the memory. Truth on these matters is not only very difficult to attain, but requires long time and a gradual process for its appropriation. There is a growth and a continuity in learning, as in other things, which advances by slow degrees, and very seldom by rapid bounds. We must not then be discontented with incompleteness and transitional knowledge. The facts which to us seem heterogeneous and confused are nevertheless worth acquiring by our generation, because they will be the foundation for the more lucid convictions of those who come after us. We may have little idea of the final shape of those convictions, but underground labour in teaching and learning is nevertheless very essential to their ripeness and solidity. The truth at last acquired is not really new, much less discordant from the old truths, but it is alive and growing, not shut up within the barriers in which any one generation has enclosed it. And it is one of the noblest prerogatives of Holy Scripture to be thus relatively new to every age. It is always capable of being put in fresh lights, of yielding fresh instruction to each student who approaches it with reverence and purity of intention. If therefore Dr. Farrar has, as we think, put into the hands of a large class of persons, almost untouched before, a mass of trustworthy facts about the New Testament, and put them in the way to become for the first time matter of general knowledge, he has done a great service to the cause of religious education and divine truth, even though the form of his work may not be absolutely permanent.

The danger of course is, that in bringing down these facts to the level of common intelligence an author may tend to vulgarize religion, or at least to remove the sense of mystery and reverence which ought to lie close about it. This is, we think, a very real danger. It was this that spoiled and

degraded the work of the early Franciscans, who began so hopefully, and performed the inestimable service of bringing back to the ordinary men and women of their day the real apprehension of Christ's manhood, and of the home life of Bethlehem and Nazareth. A certain personal self-satisfaction, a feeling of knowing all that can be known, of being as it were behind the scenes with Divine Providence, creeps naturally and fatally over popular religionists.

Dr. Farrar has shown that he is fully alive to this danger of vulgarization in a recent and powerful sermon on the Salvation Army. He has also, we believe, revealed it by the marked respect with which he received the criticism of Dr. Pusey, whose almost Judaic sense of the reality and simple certainty of the Divine revelation was accompanied by an almost apostolic feeling of the awfulness of Christian responsibility and of the mystery surrounding the Creed.

The writer of the *Life of Christ* did indeed seem to us when we first read his book to be in some danger of so representing the humanity of Our Saviour in such clear and distinct outlines, with so little shade and reserve, as to lead his less cautious readers into something like the condition of the men of Nazareth, who, knowing the outside look and circumstances of the life of Jesus, presumed to think that they knew all about Him. We believe, however, that we can trace a change in the last book; we perceive, if we may venture to say so, a deepened sense of the mystery of Holy Scripture, and of the reverence due to the opinion of the Church.

It is time now to speak of the book before us rather more in detail. The subject treated in it is not so much the early days of Christianity in general, as the matter and surroundings of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. But it contains so much general history that the title is not a misnomer. It is divided into five books, headed respectively: (1) The World; (2) S. Peter and the Church Catholic; (3) Apollos, Alexandrian Christianity and the Epistle to the Hebrews; (4) Judaic Christianity; (5) The Earlier Life and Works of S. John.

The first book consists of four very brilliant chapters on the degeneracy of Paganism and the life and reign of Nero. These are chapters which the reader will hurry through almost without taking breath. It is a period which has been often and well described before; but, considering the chapters as a popular sketch giving a vivid and incisive presentation of perhaps the darkest age of Roman history, we do not know where to turn for a better one. The scenes, especially of the

life
her
clas
in q
per
the
puri
Far
posi
supp
ism
ster
peri
The
puts
mur
by h
ingr
He i
her t
(1
peron
silenc
the ta
plicity
the si
be or
the vo
two m
now g
either
Præto
belove
soldie
at the
scenes
Apost
prison

1 J
actual
few pa
probab
and W
a want
book.
also ra
sign of

life of Agrippina, the murders of Claudius and Britannicus, her own death, and the death of Nero, though well known to classical scholars, become public property in a book like this in quite a new sense. The reader gets a haunting, sickening perception of a time of depravity and terror, which is perhaps the best preparation for appreciating the divine peace and purity of Christian morals. We are sincerely grateful to Dr. Farrar for bringing the two into such close and telling juxtaposition. The writer of *Seekers after God* can hardly be supposed wanting in sympathy with what was good in Stoicism or any other form of Pagan virtue. Yet he is one of the sternest painters of the decadence and hopelessness of the period in which the Gospel first shone upon the Roman world. The following passage is not quite Dr. Farrar's best, but it puts the contrast most effectively. Nero having tried to murder his mother Agrippina, who had raised him to power by her crimes, and was ever after treated by him with black ingratitude, has just heard of her almost miraculous escape. He is filled with alarm at the prospect of what she may do in her thirst for vengeance (i. p. 45):—

'Burrus and Seneca were hastily summoned. To them the Emperor appealed in the extreme agitation of unsuccessful guilt. In silence and anguish the soldier and the Stoic felt, as they listened to the tale, how fatal to their reputation was their prosperous complicity with the secrets of such a court. Seneca was the first to break the silence. He asked his colleague "whether the Prætorians should be ordered to put her to death." In that hour he must have tasted the very dregs of the bitter cup of moral degradation. Perhaps the two ministers excused themselves with the sophism that things had now gone too far to prevent the commission of a crime, and that either Agrippina or Nero must perish. But Burrus replied that "the Prætorians would never lift a hand against the daughter of their beloved Germanicus. Let Anicetus fulfil his promise." Miserable soldier! Miserable philosopher! Stoicism has been often exalted at the expense of Christianity. Let the world remember the two scenes, in one of which the polished Stoic, in the other the Christian Apostle stood; the one a magnificent minister, the other a fettered prisoner—in the presence of the Lord of the world.'

¹ In the last sentence it will be seen that Dr. Farrar assumes the actual trial of S. Paul before Nero, and we think with good reason. A few pages later, however, it is spoken of less absolutely: 'S. Paul in all probability had recently stood before his tribunal' (p. 62). In the *Life and Work of S. Paul*, ii. p. 553, we read 'it is not impossible.' There is a want of perfect workmanship here, which is one of the blemishes of the book. The repetition of the same word in two succeeding sentences is also rather a common weakness in these last volumes, and is, we fear, the sign of strength somewhat overtaxed. We have also marked several

Dr. Farrar naturally dwells at some length on the burning of Rome and the punishment of the Christians who were falsely accused of having caused it, and so first brought into public prominence in the capital of the world. He inclines to connect Nero himself with the conflagration, or at least puts the reports against him in the text, and the evidence in his favour in a note (p. 52). The calumnies against the Christians he attributes to the influence of the Empress Poppæa and the pantomimist Aliturus, both apparently Jewish proselytes, and both having great power over Nero (p. 62 foll.) We believe that M. Renan was the first person in our own day to make this suggestion, which is in itself very probable; but Dr. Farrar does not refer it to him. Perhaps it may be a coincidence, perhaps an older conjecture; in any case it gives a very natural explanation of what is otherwise somewhat obscure. The following description of some of the horrors of the first great persecution will appeal forcibly to the imagination of every one who has visited Rome, and indeed of every one who reads it (i. p. 68):—

'Imagine that awful scene once witnessed by the silent obelisk in the square before S. Peter's at Rome! Imagine it, that we may realize how vast is the change which Christianity has wrought in the feelings of mankind! There, where the vast dome now rises, were once the gardens of Nero. They were thronged with gay crowds, among whom the Emperor moved in his frivolous degradation, and on every side were men dying slowly on their cross of shame. Along the paths of those gardens on the autumn nights were ghastly torches blackening the ground between them with streams of sulphurous pitch, and each of those living torches was a martyr in his shirt of fire. And in the amphitheatre hard by, in sight of twenty thousand spectators, famished dogs were tearing to pieces some of the best and purest of men and women, hideously disguised in the skins of bears or wolves. Thus did Nero baptize in the blood of martyrs the city which was to be for ages the capital of the world.'

Then follow some telling remarks about the terrible æsthetic realism which then prevailed, and which always threatens to assert itself again as morality decays, and when Art, the handmaid, is exalted to the throne which belongs to her mistress Virtue. 'Comedy must be actual shame, and tragedy genuine bloodshed. When the play of Afranius, called "The Conflagration," was put on the stage, a house must be really burnt and its furniture really plundered. In

places where the notes do not contain the references to passages quoted or referred to in the text, which we really want to verify, but a number of references of unequal value rather hurriedly massed together.

the mime called "Laureolus" an actor must really be crucified and mangled by a bear, and really fling himself down and deluge the stage with blood' (p. 69). To this class of exhibitions Dr. Farrar (p. 71) refers the strange expression of the First Epistle of S. Clement (c. vi.), where he speaks of 'women, Danaids, and Dirces' suffering cruel and unholy insults and safely reaching the goal in the race of faith, just after he has described the martyrdoms of S. Peter and S. Paul, and those of the 'vast multitude' of the elect who were gathered together in their company. This is the opinion of many commentators, including Hefele and Renan; but we think that Bishop Lightfoot has done more safely, because more naturally, though with less rhetorical point, in accepting Bishop Wordsworth's well-known emendation, γυναῖκες, νεανίδες, παιδίσκαι (i.e. women, maidens, and slave-girls) for γυναῖκες, Δαναίδες καὶ Δίρκαι.

The second book, 'S. Peter and the Church Catholic,' is less popular, but it embraces a great deal of valuable material. The fifth chapter contains a summary of the writings of the Apostles and early Christians, and points out very well the superiority of the Canonical Epistles to those of Clement and 'Barnabas,' the first eclectic without genius, the second Pauline almost to heresy.¹ This contrast is very necessary to be observed in the discussion as to the date and authenticity of some of the Catholic Epistles, especially those of S. Peter and S. James, and Dr. Farrar recurs to it very properly in that connection. If they and some of the 'Pauline' epistles are later and not authentic, then some of the most beautiful and effective of Christian writings are to be attributed to unknown persons in the second century, who assumed a name not their own with a fraud that can hardly be dignified as 'pious.'

¹ Dr. Farrar is, perhaps, rather hard upon such mystical interpretations as that of the number of Abraham's servants in Barnabas ch. ix., which he calls 'Rabbinic, but not Christian' (p. 105). He has shown the same feeling in a paper in the *Expositor* called, we believe, 'The Clearing of the Commentaries,' and many in the present day will sympathize with him. But is it not wiser to be more generous to those who do not feel themselves able to set such distinct limits to the meaning and analogical import of the sacred text? Such commentators might say of Dr. Farrar that he was 'Antiochene but not Alexandrian'—though his study of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that he has a feeling of sympathy even for Rabbinical interpretations (p. 356). Bishop Pearson certainly speaks of 'the forward zeal of some ancient Fathers' in this connection, but his notes show how important and widespread authority there is for this particular interpretation (*On the Creed*, p. 356 foll. Oxford 1864). We may notice, by the way, that Dr. Farrar has fallen into a curious but explicable blunder on this matter. The number 318 is not 'represented by ΙΗΤ,' but by ΤΙΗ, though Barnabas, explaining the Greek words δεκαοκτώ καὶ τριακοσίους, naturally puts the ιη' before the ς'.

It may indeed be urged, by those who reject the Pauline authorship of the 'Hebrews,' that that Epistle long went under a false name, and was only of late assigned to its rightful owner, or at least its rightful position in the Canon. But the cases are not at all parallel, as the Epistle to the Hebrews was from the first anonymous, and in any case is earlier than the Epistle of Clement (circa A.D. 95). We think, then, that the historical improbability of a fraudulent palming off of such powerful and genuinely Christian documents upon an age by no means simply uncritical far outweighs any difficulties of internal evidence or unequal attestation, the existence of which we do not blink or deny. Dr. Farrar feels the force of this, and therefore while he states without reserve the difficulties which beset the Second Epistle of S. Peter, and particularly the coincidences with Josephus to which he and Dr. Abbott have recently called attention, he inclines to conclude that 'it is still in its main essence genuine as well as canonical, and that there is a reason both for its peculiarities and for its tardy reception' (p. 207). This reason he finds in the supposition that the Epistle is mainly the work of some one else to whom the Apostle gave 'the sanction of his name and the assistance of his advice.' But this seems an awkward way out of the difficulty, especially when we remember the strongly personal touches—the forecast of his own death (i. 15), the reminiscences of the Transfiguration (i. 16 foll.), the reference to the First Epistle (iii. 1), and to 'our beloved brother Paul' (iii. 15). Expressions like these surely prove that the Epistle is authentic, unless we adopt the improbable supposition that it is the work of a clever imitator of authenticity. There seems to be no mean between these alternatives. Nor does Dr. Farrar meet Dr. Abbott's difficulty, except by the rather difficult suggestion: 'If, then, the Epistle be genuine, it cannot be questioned that it was known to Josephus' (p. 193). There are, however, at least two other suppositions possible. The first, that S. Peter and Josephus both have verbal reminiscences of the same older book or books; the second, that the similarity of style is due to the fact that the Second Epistle of S. Peter is a translation. With regard to the first possibility, until Philo and Josephus are both properly indexed, or rather have, as they ought to have, perfect concordances made to them, it is very hard to prove much about them. Had Philo's *Life of Moses*, for instance, been searched as carefully as Josephus, it is possible that all these phrases—some of them common enough—might have been found in the earlier writer. But considering the facts actually before

us,
bab
of
Far
it, c
exc
Is i
its v
by J
gran
ing
orig
ing
para
the
sake
tran
comp
uppe
Part
phra
asser
book
writt
than
Matt
that
Gree
very
with
sently
comm
have
first
simila
same
as us
interp
ἐμνη
our op
scribe
Mark

¹ G
thrown
² P.

us, we think that the second supposition is much more probable: that the similarity is due to the style of the translator of S. Peter's letter being moulded on that of Josephus. Dr. Farrar, indeed, considers this idea of a translation, but rejects it, observing that the Epistle has 'an energy of its own, which excludes the possibility of its being a translation' (p. 207). Is it not, however, true that the book of Ecclesiasticus has, in its way, a great deal of energy, though it is a translation made by Jesus the son of Sirach some time after the death of his grandfather? What is still more to the purpose, in considering this and similar cases where a translation from an Aramaic original has been supposed—as in that of the Gospel according to S. Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews—is the parallel of Josephus himself. He tells us in his preface to the *Wars of the Jews*, 'I have proposed to myself, for the sake of such as live under the government of the Romans, to translate those books into the Greek tongue which I formerly composed in the language of our own country and sent to the upper barbarians,' that is, as he informs us a little later, the Parthians and Babylonians, and the Jews beyond the Euphrates and in the neighbouring lands. Yet no one can assert that the *Wars of the Jews*, in its Greek dress, is a book deficient in energy and rhetorical power. It is certainly written in a style of Greek far more flowing and classical than the books which bear the names of S. Peter and S. Matthew, if not the Epistle to the Hebrews. We believe that S. Peter himself was incapable of writing or speaking Greek with fluency, and that his incapacity was shared, very possibly, by the other writers of the Catholic Epistles, with the exception of S. John, who, as we shall see presently, was probably a good many years in acquiring a full command of the language. With regard to S. Peter, we have the fact that ancient Church tradition (appearing first in Papias) calls S. Mark his 'interpreter,' while a similar report names another, Glaucias, as having held the same position.¹ This word has been variously explained, but as used by Papias its natural meaning is surely one who interpreted from Aramaic into Greek. Certainly the verb *ἑρμηνεύειν* has this sense in the other closely parallel and, in our opinion, contextual sentence in which the same writer describes the Gospel according to S. Matthew.² To say that S. Mark made S. Peter's meaning clear to others, as we talk

¹ Glaucias, it is said, became a Gnostic. Could his apostasy have thrown suspicion on any of the work done by him for the Apostle?

² Papias in Eusebius, *Church History*, iii. 39, 15, 16.

metaphorically of 'interpreting' a piece of music, or that he interpreted for him into Latin, is certainly less natural.¹ We have no trace of Latin preaching in Rome till a considerably later date, and certainly none of a Latin Gospel of S. Mark. What seems probable, then, is that S. Peter preached everywhere in the synagogues in Aramaic, a procedure which would endear him to those of Hebrew birth and education (cp. Acts xxii. 2), and that S. Mark interpreted on the spot into Greek for the benefit of the Hellenists and proselytes who might be present. Modern missions could, we suppose, supply many instances of such a double method of preaching to a congregation made up of different races. His epistles were probably rendered by two distinct translators. The second very possibly remained untranslated longer than the first, and this would explain the fact that it seems to have been little known to the Churches of the first and second centuries.² This explanation, we may remark, helps to throw light on two peculiar features of this group of epistles, the 'mixture of presents and futures' in which Dr. Farrar finds a difficulty (p. 195) and the remarkable Æschylean phraseology. S. Peter and S. Jude could hardly themselves have written in poetic Greek 'which they had partly learnt from the language of the tragedians'—as Dr. Farrar well tells us the writers of these epistles do (p. 207 note, cp. p. 236 note). But those who had learnt Greek for the purpose of translating Aramaic writings would naturally have this strange book-learned style, in which the diction is superior to the grammar and syntax. We are most of us familiar with Bengali English, which frequently presents something similar in its mixture of poetic colouring and awkward syntax. The same remarks apply in their measure to the Epistle of S. James.

We have little or no fault to find with Dr. Farrar's treatment of the 'spirits in prison' and the 'Gospel preached to the dead.' He is careful to note that 'there is no dogma either of universalism or of conditional immortality' in S. Peter (p. 141); and, apart from some rather hard words about 'dogmatic embarrassment,' when he might rather have

¹ Dr. Farrar rather wavers on S. Mark's relation to S. Peter, but suggests 'interpretation' into Latin (vol. ii. p. 21 note).

² Dr. Farrar says (i. p. 178), 'It is not found . . . in the *Vetus Itala*.' The phrase '*Vetus Itala*' is now generally given up by Biblical scholars. He probably means 'was not known to Tertullian and the early African Church.' The true '*Itala*,' the version or versions used in Italy, is a different thing. The existence of a Latin translation of this epistle anterior to S. Jerome seems at least probable from the character of the text in the Cava and Toledo MSS.

saic
tion
bou

clud
the
the
dea
this
Lip
and
boo
fair
by
sug
the
says
(circ

tion,
the I
our C
comi
marty

He c
nysi
S. P
atten
dispo
strict
and
early
the C
sense
prob
is jus

¹ L
Work
the us
moder
cohere
impres
² I
iv. 23
the la
'Opūdre

said 'fearfulness of error and careful adherence to the tradition of the Church,' he has kept the subject within its proper bounds in such a book (pp. 137-143).

As to S. Peter's connexion with Rome, Dr. Farrar concludes, with most moderate and learned English writers since the time of Bishop Pearson,¹ that the Apostle was martyred there, but did not preach there till within a short time of his death. He does not, however, add much to the discussion of this difficult subject. We miss references to such books as Lipsius' *Petrus-Sage* and *Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe*, and even to Bishop Lightfoot's edition of Clement and older books. The evidence of Dionysius of Corinth is not very fairly treated. It is said to be 'a slight allusion' neutralized by 'being found in the same sentence with the erroneous suggestion that Peter had a share in the founding (φύρειαν) of the Church of Corinth' (ii. p. 513). What Dionysius really says is, writing to the Church of Rome in the days of Soter (circa A.D. 170):—

'So you (as Clement in his day), through your valuable admonition, have brought into union the planting of Peter and Paul among the Romans and Corinthians. For both of them, having planted in our Corinth also, taught us in like manner; and in like manner also, coming together as teachers in Italy, gave their testimony' (or 'were martyred,' ἐμαρτύρησαν) 'at the same time.'²

He could hardly have spoken more strongly. Surely Dionysius of Corinth knew much better than any of us whether S. Peter had worked in his own city or not. It is absurd to attempt to prove a negative with the slight materials at our disposal. That he founded the Church of Corinth in the strictest sense is obviously untrue; but words like 'founding' and 'planting' are used vaguely and generally by the early Fathers for any Apostolic work near the beginning of the Gospel. It is clear that S. Paul did not, in the strictest sense, 'found' the Roman Church; and the same thing is probably even more true of S. Peter, yet the Church of Rome is justified in using ordinary language when she styles them

¹ *De Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum*, capp. vi.-viii.—*Minor Works*, vol. ii. pp. 323-366. It is a great mistake to suppose that all the useful facts contained in such dissertations have been absorbed into modern books on the subject. Bishop Pearson's work is so solid and coherent that it must be examined at length in order to make its proper impression.

² Dionysius in Eusebius, *Ch. History*, ii. 25. 8, taken together with iv. 23. 11: εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμοσε διδάξαντες is rendered by Valesius as if the last word was φοιτήσαντες. Cp. Routh, *Rel. Sacra*, i. p. 191 foll. 'Ὁμοσε, however, perhaps rather implies meeting from different quarters.

her founders and builders (cp. *Iren.* iii. 1 and 3). There is also a hint in S. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy which suggests a time for this partnership in work of which Dionysius speaks. 'Erastus (he writes) abode at Corinth, and Trophimus I left behind at Miletus sick' (2 Tim. iv. 20). Whether the two events are stated in chronological or inverse order, the words seem to show that S. Paul had been at Corinth shortly before his second Roman imprisonment. It is not unnatural to suppose that a meeting with S. Peter at this time led to their cordial co-operation at Corinth, and was a prelude to even more important work in Rome.

Dr. Farrar throws no light on the 'twenty-five years of S. Peter,' except to show that it is dropped as a dogma by more enlightened Roman Catholics. It seems, however, to be a point deserving of explanation, and capable of being further illustrated. The following account of how the belief arose was suggested by reading Dr. Salmon's valuable paper on the 'Chronology of Hippolytus' in the Dublin *Hermathena*, which it appears worth while to offer to the consideration of scholars. It seems, in short, to be a datum having no positive value whatever, but merely to represent the interval between the supposed date of the appointment of Linus to the episcopate and the ascension of Our Lord. The date of the appointment of Linus was fixed not by any actual synchronism of consular or other dates, but by reckoning back from some known point in the second or third century with the aid of a list of the Roman pontiffs, containing merely the number of years during which each presided.¹ As in the earlier names on this list, portions of years were most probably counted as full years, the aggregate term was considerably swelled out, and so the appointment of Linus was fixed to the year 55, probably ten or twelve years too early. The interval between this date and the Ascension, which we may reasonably suppose to have been fixed by tradition to the year 29, the consulship of the two Gemini, was then assigned to S. Peter. This was no pretence or deception at all, but a very natural process, since the chronologists wished to carry up the succession of Bishops to Christ Himself. But, after a time, this twenty-five years came to be considered to have a positive value, and was made to harmonize with a legendary visit of S. Peter to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and a possibly

¹ 'Nomina Episcoporum Romæ et quis quot annis præfuit.' See the unfortunately mutilated chronicle extending from Adam to the last year of Alexander Severus, A.D. 235, first published by Canisius in 1602, and reprinted in the Bonn edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* and elsewhere.

corro
of N
that
there
of th
T
the F
Farr
the a
great
fact,
no or
leave
the F
ever,
Pauli
the F
again
which
favour

'In
tone o
S. Luk
in the
believe
concili
sternne
these p
as bulv
to bap

W
of the
believe
Ephes
and in
see an
the Ch
tions s
Dr. Fa
and B
have d
that on
author
'Th
old nar

corrected date for the appointment of Linus in the last year of Nero. In some such way as this we think arose the story that S. Peter visited Rome first in the year 42, and remained there as Bishop at intervals for twenty-five years, till the end of the reign of Nero.

The third book, on 'Apollon, Alexandrian Christianity and the Epistle to the Hebrews,' is full of interest, and exhibits Dr. Farrar's powers to great advantage. He has massed together the arguments in favour of the authorship of Apollon with great skill, and if there were any historical evidence for the fact, we should have little hesitation in accepting it. But as no one even made the conjecture before Luther, we can only leave the matter in the uncertainty in which the wisest of the Fathers were satisfied to let it remain. We think, however, that, while making all allowance for the parallels of Pauline doctrine and language, he has stated the case against the Pauline authorship most ably; and that his arguments against the mediate or immediate authorship of S. Luke, which has a good deal of direct and indirect evidence in its favour, are weighty and plausible.

'In spite of these resemblances' (he says, p. 335) 'the style and tone of the Epistle to the Hebrews differ essentially from those of S. Luke. Balanced rhetoric and majestic periods are nowhere found in the writings of the Evangelist, and it is psychologically difficult to believe that a writer whose prevailing tone of mind was tender and conciliatory should have written passages of such uncompromising sternness as those which occur in Heb. vi. 4-8; x. 26; xii. 27. In these passages the sternest Montanists exulted, and they were used as bulwarks of the Novatians in their refusal to readmit the lapsed to baptism or the Lord's Supper.'

We do not think he is equally powerful in his treatment of the destination of the Epistle, which he rather inclines to believe may have been 'the Jewish portion of the Church of Ephesus, where both Apollon and Timothy were well known, and in which they had both laboured' (p. 344). We do not see any sufficient reason to doubt the traditional belief that the Church of Jerusalem is intended; nay, certain considerations seem to point very conclusively to it. In the first place Dr. Farrar has not met the strong arguments of Delitzsch and Bleek on this point—to name only two of those who have defended the received opinion—of whom it is noticeable that one inclines to S. Luke, and the other to Apollon as the author of the Epistle.

'The Church of the Hebrews,' we must remember, is an old name for the Church of Jerusalem, which Eusebius tells us

was composed of 'Hebrew believers' (ἐξ Ἑβραίων πιστῶν),¹ and ever since the time of Clement of Alexandria it has been the tradition of the Church that 'to the Hebrews' means the Christians of Jerusalem.

'The whole Epistle (says Delitzsch) gives the impression that its readers must have lived in the neighbourhood of the Temple, the antithesis throughout not being that of συναγωγή and church, but of Temple and ἐπισυναγωγή of Christians.'²

'The Churches in Jerusalem and Judæa (says Bleek) . . . consisted almost exclusively of Jews. . . . Of Gentile Christians, properly so called, there were few or none, which agrees with the contents of this Epistle, where . . . no notice whatever is taken of Gentile Christians—a fact very unlikely to have occurred if the Church the author had in his mind were made up of Jews and Gentiles together.'³

Dr. Farrar's objections to this view are (p. 342) the Greek writing and quotations from the Septuagint; ⁴ the statement 'that they had not yet resisted unto blood;' the absence of reference to Christ's actual words and sufferings in their midst; the tone of authority, especially the rebuke of ch. v. 11–14; and the mention of Timothy as one in whom they would be interested. The first difficulty we have already met by a reference to the parallel of Josephus, which shows that the Epistle may be a translation from the Aramaic, without loss of rhetorical spirit; and we may remember that the Hellenist Stephen at least made himself heard in the Jewish Sanhedrim. The assertion 'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood' is not inconsistent with the exhortation to remember the martyrdom (as it seems) of their leaders in past years made in xiii. 7. The reference is generally supposed to be to James the Just; and certainly the other historical notes in the Epistle fit well with what we know and must imagine the state of the Jewish Church shortly after his death. We may dwell for a little on this point, as it is one of some importance.

James the Just was probably martyred in the year 62, in the interval between the sudden death of Festus and the coming of Albinus as procurator. The Epistle was, we suppose,

¹ [Clementis] *Ep. ad Jacob.* Hom. xi. 35, and Eus. *H. E.* iv. 5; Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, i. p. 21, E. T.

² Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, i. p. 21, E. T.

³ Bleek, *Introd. to the New Testament*, § 199, vol. ii. p. 124, E. T.

⁴ That the quotations, however, are by no means exactly taken from the LXX has been shown in vol. x. of this *Review*, p. 369 (July 1880). About two-thirds of them are 'more or less free translations from the Hebrew; thrown off as it were rapidly by some one skilled in that and the Greek version as well.'

written
salen
so ca
natu
stron
patri
bega
no r
unde
not
Nove
appe
and i
the
belie
when
the I
The
tunity
tion,
and t
Josep
suppo
more
accou
permi
does t
phocy
thoug
have
phecie
the re
follow
withou
here a
to con
dition
they le
does it
of refer
salem
the ima
of the

¹ Dr
We thin

written a few years later, when the national party in Jerusalem were preparing for the struggle, which afterwards ended so calamitously. The position of the Hebrew Christians was naturally a very critical one. They were subject to the very strong temptation of swimming with the current, to which patriotic motives might seem so readily to lead them. They began to forsake their church assemblies, and made little or no resistance to the factions which trampled law and order under foot during that terrible period. But their Master did not suffer them to be lost. A strange moment arrived in November, A.D. 66, when Cestius Gallus, President of Syria, appeared before the city, made himself master of the suburbs and its lower parts, and commenced a vigorous assault upon the Temple, which he continued for five days. This, we believe, was the moment prophetically described by Our Lord, when His disciples should see the abomination of desolation, the Roman eagle, standing in the holy place, Mount Sion. The Lord having given the warning, gave also the opportunity of profiting by it.¹ Cestius, in a sudden fit of irresolution, without any apparent reason, called off his own troops, and to the universal surprise retreated entirely from the city. Josephus, in relating this astonishing circumstance, can only suppose that it was a design of Providence to bring about the more complete destruction of the city. 'God, I conceive, on account of our sins, abhorring His own sanctuary, would not permit the war to end thus' (*Wars*, ii. 19. 6). What a light does this strange incident throw both upon Our Lord's prophecy, and upon the conclusion of the Epistle! For even though it had not yet occurred, some such moment must have been expected by all who remembered the great prophecies of the last things. Thus we read in the Epistle of the reasons why Jesus suffered without the gate, and then follows the exhortation, 'Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after *the city* which is to come' (xiii. 13, 14, R. V.). If we refer this to the condition of the Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem just before they left their doomed and devoted city to sojourn in Pella, does it not go far to supply the want which Dr. Farrar notices of references to Our Lord's particular connection with Jerusalem? It is true that, with the exception of the word '*city*,' the imagery is throughout that of the tabernacle, rather than of the Temple of Solomon; but this fits in wonderfully with

¹ Dr. Farrar puts the flight to Pella possibly in A.D. 68, vol. ii. p. 193. We think it was probably earlier.

the parallelism between the first and last periods of Jewish history. The nation was chosen by God, and moulded for forty years before it entered Canaan. For forty years after the Ascension it was tried by the same long-suffering Providence before it was finally unmade and rejected. The writer of the Epistle had surely a perception of this most striking parallel, and as an old man goes back to the days of his childhood, so he, in the last days of Israel's national existence, goes back to Abraham, and Moses, and Aaron, and the tabernacle, and Joshua, and the forty years in the wilderness, rather than to the intervening period. He perceives that the time of trial will soon be ended, that the rest of the true Jesus will be entered by the faithful; but he fears that many will fall by the way in the wilderness, and fail to enter in by reason of unbelief and sinful compliance with the spirit of the time. This thought we believe gives a rationale and coherence to the Epistle which we miss in Dr. Farrar's interesting and instructive pages.

The point on which he lays most stress as against the Church of Jerusalem—of the sharpness of the rebuke at the end of the fifth chapter—seems to lose its force if we imagine the pain and terror which such falling away of this community would give a sincere believer, whether Hebrew or Hellenist. Here again recollect the sharpness of S. Stephen's rebuke. That the Church was in danger of such a fall, after the death of S. James and the departure or exile of S. John, is hardly to be doubted. This letter may have been of incalculable value in preventing a fall which would have distressed and weakened the whole of Christendom. The mention of Timothy is too slight to be matter of real argument; but we believe that we have fairly met the most important of Dr. Farrar's objections, and have shown, in addition, positive reasons for the general opinion on the subject, with which he does not deal.

The general treatment of the Epistle is, however, very interesting, and cannot fail to suggest new thoughts to anyone who really wishes to understand it. We should instance particularly the description of the Day of Atonement from rabbinical sources, which we wish we had space to quote, and the passages about Melchizedek.

We must pass on to the latter part of the work. Book IV. on 'Judaic Christianity' deals with the controverted topic of the 'Brethren of the Lord,' the life and character of S. James and the matter of his Epistle. Dr. Farrar's treatment of the first of these subjects has provoked, and will provoke, some hostile criticism, and we think with reason. A great deal of the

argu
in th
his m
in th
did n
begin
Tabe
But i
that
daug
Dr. F
with
giving
that
Helvi
he ha
favou
12; 1
in its
servic
Lord,
the w
medit
might
joys o
we fin
among
celibac
less te
'breth
family
natura
will tu
Brethr
they w
subject
of Dur
it is re
of scrip
is curio

1 In
by Schö
interpret
doubtful
no single
VOL.

argument is indeed sound enough. We are agreed with him in thinking the theory that the 'brethren of the Lord' were his first cousins and some of them apostles, must be given up in the face of S. John's plain statement 'even His brethren did not believe on Him'—a statement not referring to the beginning of His ministry, but to the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, some six months before its close (John viii. 5). But in our author's adoption of the Helvidian theory, which is that the mother of Our Lord had four sons and several daughters born after Our Saviour's birth, we cannot follow him. Dr. Farrar recommends this view, not merely as most accordant with what he holds the plain meaning of Scripture, but as giving dignity to marriage in opposition to celibacy. We think that in so doing he has understated the case against the Helvidian theory. In his zealous opposition to monasticism he has forgotten that both Our Lord and S. Paul speak in favour of celibacy for the kingdom of God's sake (S. Matt. xix. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 1, 6, 7, 8, 26, 34); not, that is to say, as a virtue in itself, but as affording opportunity for devotion to God's service without distraction. It is surely not true to say of Our Lord, 'He never breathed one word to exalt the celibate over the wedded life' (p. 505).¹ Surely too the unique subject of meditation which filled the mind of the Mother of the Lord, might naturally separate her from the distractions, cares and joys of common wifehood and motherhood. When, therefore, we find a widespread opinion in the early Church, especially among the Greek Fathers, unconnected with any theory as to celibacy, and particularly current in Palestine, where there was less tendency than elsewhere to depreciate marriage, that the 'brethren' and 'sisters' of Our Lord belonged to an elder family, being children of a former wife of S. Joseph, we naturally are ready to accept it. We think that if any one will turn from Dr. Farrar to Bishop Lightfoot's essay on 'The Brethren of the Lord' in his Commentary on the Galatians, they will be surprised at the slight treatment of this part of the subject in the book before us, and will agree with the Bishop of Durham that the Epiphanian theory, as it is called, though it is really much older than Epiphanius, has both the balance of scriptural evidence and tradition in its favour. Dr. Farrar is curiously incorrect when he says of this explanation, 'its first

¹ In vol. ii. p. 114, Dr. Farrar refers to 'the passages of Zohar quoted by Schöttgen, p. 159,' as explaining away the natural (not the Origenistic) interpretation of S. Matt. xix. 12. Zohar is a cabalistic book of very doubtful, possibly of very late, date, and for this particular interpretation no single Rabbi is quoted by name, but only 'learned men.'

respectable support comes at the close of the fourth century, and its earlier traces are only found embedded in worthless and pernicious forgeries' (p. 508). Bishop Lightfoot says, 'Clement of Alexandria (about A.D. 200) . . . put forward the Epiphanian solution' (*l. c.* p. 279, ed. 7). 'Origen (A.D. 253) declares himself very distinctly in favour of the Epiphanian view' (*ib.* p. 281). He also puts a higher value upon the evidence of the apocryphal literature, and supposes Hegesippus to have held the Epiphanian theory, inasmuch as both 'Eusebius and Epiphanius, who derived their information mainly from Hegesippus, gave this account of Our Lord's brethren' (p. 278). We think too that the very pertinent question why Our Lord committed His mother to S. John rather than to His 'brethren' is much more soundly treated by Bishop Lightfoot (p. 272 foll.) than by Dr. Farrar (p. 502 foll.). He has not really met the argument which the former has thus stated. Even admitting that the brethren were passed over at first as 'unbelievers,' what (he asks) does this hypothesis require us to believe?

'Though within a few days a special appearance is vouchsafed to one of these brethren who is destined to rule the mother Church of Jerusalem, and all alike are converted to the faith of Christ, yet she, their mother, living in the same city and joining with them in a common worship (Acts i. 14), is consigned to the care of a stranger,¹ of whose house she becomes henceforth the inmate.'

We do not suppose that Dr. Farrar will change his mind: but we entreat him to state the case on the other side a little more fully, and to enter a little more heartily into the feelings of those who differ from him on this topic. We notice however, with pleasure, as an indication of two currents of feeling in his mind, that he speaks of S. John as being 'one of the very few depositories of the awful mysteries which . . . had been pondered for many years in the holy reticence of the Virgin's heart' (i. 96 foll.; cp. ii. 142).

The general treatment of the authenticity of the Epistle of S. James, of its matter, and of the question of its relation to S. Paul, is very good. Our author reconciles the two views of faith and works as follows (ii. p. 94):—

'The superficial contradiction between the Apostles vanishes to nothing when we bear in mind that S. Paul is dealing with the vain confidence of legalism, S. James with the vain confidence of orthodoxy. S. Paul was writing to Gentile Christians to prevent them

¹ This word is, however, too strong, especially if S. John was, as we believe, the nephew of the Blessed Virgin, son of her sister Salome.

from
extern
of ser
thoug
Jewis
had s
who t
—tha
corda
of the
which
meant
tell ed
orthod
profess

TH
second
S. Joh
history
three
Gosp
what
of the
agree
and th
using
here, a
heretic
poetic
In the
theolog
tage b
refused
where
someth
probab
a very
Dr. Far
towards
someti
of faith
can onl
Am
S. John
of the
with hi

from being seduced into trusting for salvation to the adoption of external badges and ceremonials or to good deeds done in a spirit of servile fear. S. James is arguing either with Jewish bigots who thought that a profession of Monotheism and a participation in Jewish privileges would save them, or with mistaken Paulinists who had snatched up a formula which they did not understand, and who thought that justification could be severed from sanctification—that a saving faith was possible without the holiness of an accordant life. S. Paul is contrasting faith in Christ with the works of the law; S. James is contrasting a dead mixed faith with a faith which evidences its reality by holy works. S. Paul's arguments were meant to overthrow the vain confidence of the Pharisee; S. James's tell equally against the Jew who pillowed his hopes on fruitless orthodoxy and the Antinomian who identified saving faith with barren profession.

The fifth and last book, occupying the greater part of the second volume, is headed 'On the Earlier Life and Works of S. John'; but—inasmuch as a large portion of it deals with the history of the fall of Jerusalem, the growth of heresy, and the three Epistles, the first of which Dr. Farrar puts after the Gospel, though in close connection with it—the title is somewhat inconsistent with the contents. Dr. Farrar's treatment of the legends respecting S. John is full and interesting. We agree with him in thinking that the story about Cerinthus and the bath is discredited by the improbability of an Apostle using such a place of Gentile and frivolous resort. But both here, and in his treatment of the command not to receive a heretic and bid him God speed, he is carried away by that poetic 'hate of hate,' with which he is so highly dowered. In the latter case there is a long passage against the *odium theologicum* (ii. pp. 497–503), which surely might with advantage be omitted. If the lady did as S. John desired, and refused a traveller because he was a heretic, in a country where inns were few and hospitality a virtue, she was doing something no doubt perfectly right, but which the heretic probably thought very unkind. The *odium theologicum* is a very odious thing, but truth sometimes may require us (as Dr. Farrar shows) to be apparently hard and unsympathetic towards those who differ from us, sometimes in self-defence, sometimes in defence of those who belong to the household of faith. The cases where this is right and where it is wrong can only be settled by reference to particular circumstances.

Among the traditions with respect to the later days of S. John we miss the account of the origin of his Gospel, and of the presence of his brother-Apostles, Andrew and Philip, with him at Ephesus. Though this is more or less dis-

cussed elsewhere (*eg.* ii. pp. 358, 374), it is clearly in place in chap. xxvi., and is indeed necessary to the picture. That Andrew and Philip were present in Asia Minor is an independent tradition;¹ that Andrew—the ready suggester, who thinks and decides for others, as he is described to us in the Gospel—was the suggester also of S. John's writing, is the very probable report of the Muratorian fragment; that Andrew and Philip are the two unnamed disciples of S. John xxi. 2, and specially concerned with the production of the whole chapter and its final attestation, is a very plausible opinion. A few words here might save space elsewhere.

The reader will naturally turn with some excitement of feeling to the chapters on the Apocalypse. Dr. Farrar, as might be expected, is one of those who place the exile to Patmos in the reign of Nero, not in that of Domitian. He does not succeed in explaining S. Irenæus' well-known statement that it was seen shortly before his own time in the reign of Domitian—for *ἐπαύθῃ* in this connection cannot seriously be referred to S. John's own person. He does however recal with some force the other probably mistaken tradition which S. Irenæus gives, as a set-off against the decisive weight we should naturally assign to his testimony, and he states the case for the earlier date with vigour and persuasiveness. To us the difference of style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel, and the contrast between the vivid and abrupt force of the one and the admirable and quiet precision of the other, has for some time seemed a very strong argument for the separation of the two by as long an interval as possible, and for putting the Gospel and Epistles late in the Apostle's life. If S. John (and, as we have suggested, the other Apostles of the circumcision) was at first hardly acquainted with Greek as a written language—perhaps hardly able to speak it with ease and correctness at all—the Apocalypse would come in naturally as a first attempt at composition in Greek, forced from him by the burning spirit of the time, when he was called in his exile to minister to the Churches of Asia. Like Jeremiah in his prison house he may have had a faithful scribe by his side as he paced the bleak cliffs and seashore of Patmos, or sat within some retired cave. A book so written would bear the marks which the Apocalypse does. Here we have several series of addresses and visions not following chronologically but as parallel aspects of the same truths, each series leading up to the

¹ See Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 45.

great
over
of vi
glow
mout
unde
the e
sonar
must
nation
has th
in the

T
teach
work
and o
preach
subject
pedan
many
learn
learn
names
desire
Thirty
ence
way w
that w
than t
than t
the car

As
decide
Proph
and J
Dr. F
passag

'To
other th
him wh
and TH
happen
emphati
will occ
book is

great thought of the Advent and the Judgment as a triumph over the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. It is a book of visions, spoken rather than written, pouring with all the glow and fervour of immediate perception from the Prophet's mouth, and no wonder that the language sometimes cracks under the strain of the thought. The promise to the Seer at the end of the tenth chapter is also, like the language, consonant with the earlier rather than the later date. 'Thou must prophesy again before' (R. V. 'over') 'many peoples and nations and tongues and kings,' applies better to one who has thirty years of work still before him than to an old man in the last days of his life.

The Gospel, on the other hand, is like the work of a teacher who has lived long in a settled society of fellow-workers and scholars, who has repeated the same lessons over and over again, though, as Eusebius tells us, with 'unwritten preaching,' and reflected much upon the difficulties of his subject, and the questions which an almost academic and pedantic type of heresy has suggested. His companions for many years, perhaps, have been Greeks, and some of them learned—at least in the way that Apollos and Philo were learned. Andrew and Philip, the two Apostles with Greek names, who introduced to the Lord the first 'Greeks' who desired to see Jesus, have probably long been at his side. Thirty years in such an atmosphere accounts for the difference both of style and tone, and shows the two books in a way which is at least reasonable: and no other hypothesis that we know does so. It is a better hypothesis certainly than that of 'John the Presbyter,' and more decidedly still than the rejection of one or other of these Divine books from the canon.

As to the *interpretation* of the book, Dr. Farrar is a decided Præterist. Nero to him is the Beast, and the False Prophet is a composite symbol of Vespasian, Simon Magus, and Josephus; Domitian is the Beast reviving, and so on. Dr. Farrar's principles are well stated in the following passages (pp. 228, 229):—

'To me it seems that the founder of the Præterist school is none other than S. John himself. For he records the Christ as saying to him when he was in the Spirit, "Write the things which thou sawest, and THE THINGS WHICH ARE, and the things which are about to happen (*ἃ μέλλει γίνεσθαι*) after these things." . . . The Seer emphatically says that the future events which he has to foreshadow will occur *speedily* (*ἐν τάχει*), and the recurrent burden of his whole book is the nearness of the Advent (*ὁ καιρὸς ἔγγυς*). . . . The

Præterist mode of interpretation does not, however, interfere with that view of prophecy which was so well defined by Dr. Arnold. This is the view of those who have been called the "spiritual" interpreters. It admits of the *analogical* application of prophecy to conditions which in the cycles of history bear a close resemblance to each other. It applies to all times the principles originally laid down with reference to events which were being then enacted, and starts with the axiom of Bacon, that Divine prophecies have steps and grades of fulfilment through divers ages. All that is really valuable in the works of historical interpreters may thus be retained.

We do not suppose that the ingenious explanation and common-sense rationalizing of the Apocalypse by the facts of that period of blood and terror, prevalent as it seems to be at present, will really long suffice to satisfy those who believe in the deep things of prophecy. But as Præterists like Dr. Farrar can admit the use of the 'spiritual' views of other schools by way of illustration, so can other interpreters accept many of the historical facts, which Dr. Farrar so effectively marshals together, as forming the natural occasions for prophetic forecasts of a wider and more mysterious import.

There is much in the treatment of the growth of heresy and the Epistles of S. John which is worth noticing, but we have not space for it here. We have naturally had rather to remark on points where we differ from Dr. Farrar, and where we think that he might strengthen and improve his position. If he could reduce his book by about a third, and concentrate it, and make it rigorously consistent, it would be much more valuable, and we think more likely to have a permanent place in theological literature. But in any case we are thankful to him for the greatest part of these volumes. We value much his warmth of heart, his poetical temperament, his moral indignation, his religious earnestness, his wide reading and appreciation of learning, his zeal and his eloquence. To a character like this compliments are out of place. He has placed his gifts at the service of the Gospel, not in any conventional sense, but as a work of conscience. By works of great labour he has brought home the meaning of biblical literature to classes of immense importance to the Church in a way that no other author of our day has done. We trust that having done so much and so well, he will not shrink from the further and greater labour of retrenching what is redundant, of harmonizing what is inconsistent, of removing what is needlessly antagonistic, and of making permanently better what is at present really good.

It is
preac
'Hea
at th
suppo
subse
we a
tioush
of th
author
the C
That
Roya
have
such
was d
by th
withd
fact t
Churc
religio
other
any at
author
stance
time v
with l
the ot
for ger
to hon
and it

ART. V.—THE CLAIMS OF AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

1. '*Hear the Church.*' A Sermon preached in the Chapel Royal in St. James's Palace, June 17, 1838. By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. (London, 1838.)
2. *The Influence of Authority on Matters of Opinion.* By SIR GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart. (London, 1875.)
3. *Report of Church Congress at Derby, 1882.* (Derby.)

IT is hard upon five-and-forty years ago that a sermon was preached in the Chapel Royal, St. James's, upon the words, 'Hear the Church.' The sermon attracted great attention at the time, and provoked much criticism. Indeed, it is supposed to have had a very marked influence upon the subsequent fortunes of the preacher. Hastily prepared, as we are now informed, and perhaps in some respects incautiously expressed, it was still a bold and unqualified assertion of the claims of authority in matters of religion, though of authority of one kind only, viz. that vested in a branch of the Catholic Church possessed of Apostolical succession. That such an announcement from the pulpit of the Chapel Royal at the lips of one of her Majesty's chaplains should have provoked so much comment, and should have stirred such warm feelings both among Churchmen and statesmen, was due not to any formal abandonment of her just rights by the National Church, nor to any actual or even virtual withdrawal of their submission by her members, but to the fact that, so far as any formal statement of them went, the Church's claims had long been in abeyance, and good and religious people had been guided by her Prayer Book and other formularies to a great extent unconsciously, and without any attempt to define either the source or the limits of the authority which they yet loyally accepted. Many circumstances had combined to produce this state of things. At a time when loyalty to the throne was in such close alliance with loyalty to the Church the authority of the one and of the other had become strangely confused. Churchmen had for generations been accustomed to be taught by their Church to honour the King and by the State to cling to the Church, and it had not occurred to them to draw clear logical dis-

tinctions in the matter. Not that the distinction was not there. It was on their shelves, in many a venerable though dusty and neglected tome. The movement of 1835-40 did but revive a dormant theology and call into new life and language a divinity which had long slumbered in the studies of country parsonages and in the libraries of the Universities. At the commencement of the movement the Oxford divines were always glad to appeal to the authority of Beveridge and his school; but in the meanwhile the distinct claims of the Church had become greatly obscured, and the honoured rallying cry of 'Church and King!' had caught a tone dangerously akin to Erastianism.

Nor was the danger imminent from this side only. Whilst the authority of the Church was thus falling into abeyance the co-ordinate authority of Holy Scripture was destined to receive a rude, and at the time a very alarming, shock. It is true that in the Church of England these two authorities had from the first exercised their legitimate and co-ordinate jurisdiction. She had distinctly accepted the three Creeds, and her appeal had been to the sacred Scriptures as interpreted by the ancient fathers. But on the Continent, and in those reformed communities with which, from political as much as from doctrinal affinities, she had been intimately connected, it was not so. When private judgment ran into absolute riot, and the authority of the Church had been utterly obscured, if not formally denied, the Continental reformers were driven by sheer necessity to cast themselves upon that of Scripture, and, by a natural exaggeration, to clothe with this authority every word—nay, virtually, every translation—of the Bible. So they were led to inaugurate, or at the least to countenance, a theory of literal inspiration which was destined to be the source of no small embarrassment in a subsequent more critical era. In England the same causes were in operation, though happily to a less injurious extent. Among the Nonconformists absolutely, and in a considerable degree within the Church as well, the dictum of Chillingworth expressed the popular sentiment:—'The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' It was not yet perceived that in this, as in every other case, the authority which appeared to be intensified was in fact attenuated by exaggeration, and the claims of Holy Scripture to regulate the faith and direct the conscience of mankind began to suffer, as those of the Church had suffered 300 years before, from a forced and unnatural isolation. A critical school arose in Germany which soon made its influence felt in England. The authenticity of every

part
its
now
of t
of
surv
faith
rece
in re
mor
time
the

Eng
of E
grou
supp
Chur
critic
Scrip
adm
of th
was
Man
unab
both
respe

N
critic
ture
with
tende
the f
the a
viol
philos
quest
and c
was,
assum
arbitr
not o
is the
can h
a cal

part of Scripture was assailed in turn, and with its authenticity its authority was attacked as well. It may be that we can now see that much good has resulted from the free criticism of the sacred text, and from the more scientific examination of the composition of Holy Scripture and the historical survey of the canon. It may be that we can now feel that the faith is recovering from the severe shock which it then received from the 'free handling' of its inspired records, and in regaining its equilibrium is perhaps settling down upon a more secure basis; but there can be little doubt that at the time the blow to authority was a very severe one, if only from the irreverence with which the movement was accompanied.

Thus the revolutionary wave of 1830 found the Church of England, and not the Church only but the general Christianity of England, but ill prepared to assert upon clear and distinct grounds the authority upon which it rested. The State support was rapidly giving way, the spiritual claims of the Church were in a manner forgotten, and an age of merciless criticism was to weaken, at least for a time, the authority of Scripture. At this crisis the Oxford divines certainly did admirable service in recalling attention to the Divine origin of the Church, and to the Divine authority with which she was empowered to speak as the witness to revealed truth. Many an English Churchman, both lay and cleric, who was unable to follow the school in its later developments has both felt and acknowledged his obligations to them in this respect.

Nor did the difficulty or danger cease here. To the critical school which undermined the authority of Holy Scripture succeeded a school of metaphysics, which associated itself with physical science and fought under its colours. Its tendency was distinctly towards materialism. It attacked the foundations of *all* religious faith, and herein thrust aside the authority of conscience itself, and did not scruple to do violence to the religious instincts of mankind. With the philosophers of this school the Being of God became an open question, whilst every truth of nature and of the soul, of life and duty, was resolved into a question of pure intellect. This was, in fact, their marked characteristic. The intellect was assumed to be the highest constituent of man's nature, the arbiter in all spiritual questions, supreme in the departments not of science only, but of faith and morals also. This, then, is the point to which we have at last arrived; and no time can be more appropriate to a review of our position, nor to a calm and reasonable investigation of those claims to autho-

rity which we believe may be legitimately put forward in the names of conscience, of Holy Scripture, and of the Church—the first as establishing the very basis of morals and of religion, the second as conveying the revelation of Divine truth, the third as formulating and bearing witness to that revelation.

It may be within the recollection of our readers that in a recent number of this Review we discussed the claims of free thought, and were led to assign to it a legitimate province and an important office in the investigation of religious truth. It was admitted that even in the sphere of religion, to which it has been popularly held to be antagonistic, it is capable of rendering valuable service, of contributing to preserve truth in its purity and to free it from the incrustations of prejudice or habit. At the same time it was maintained that it could discharge this office only under certain conditions and with important limitations.

The principle of authority, with which we come now to deal, may perhaps be described as the rival of free thought; but if we adopt this distinction we by no means imply that they are necessarily hostile to each other. On the contrary, there is a point of view from which they are mutually dependent, and each positively necessary to the other. If we except the precise dogmas of revelation, authority is indebted to free thought for her sceptre and her domain. It is thought, free and expansive, which supplies the material over which authority ultimately exercises her sway; whilst, on the other hand, it is authority which, so to say, collects and maintains in their cohesion the truths which speculation has ascertained and which form the groundwork of fresh discoveries in the future.

It is maintained by Mr. Wilsøn, in the very able paper read by him at the Derby Church Congress, that the two move altogether in different planes, that there is no fear of their collision, no danger resulting from their antagonism. 'One is the force regarded as securing growth, the other the same force as securing continuity.' We confess that we do not think that this is strictly so, that the forces are identical, or that, in practice, their working is always so harmonious as is here implied. Mr. Wilson admits that 'the facts of conscience, of consciousness, of hope, and aspiration and worship' are 'spiritual facts which have no verification but themselves, and that 'these facts lie in a region equally beyond authority and free thought;' but it must be remembered that free thought has not scrupled from time to

tim
rep
gon
cee
as
of
'sp
in
axi
a c
con
to t
tran
than
the
mas
whi
Wil
any
the
ced
with
an a
reco
auth
whic
twec
dang
kind
that
emir

I
auth
It ha
thing

So su
to the
but i
schoo
heard

time to deal very arbitrarily with these 'facts;' that she has repeatedly questioned the very existence of conscience, and gone far to displace the received basis of morals without succeeding in suggesting in its place any which can be accepted as satisfactory; and that so far as she has indulged in theories of materialism she has done much to deny altogether the 'spiritual facts of hope, and aspiration and worship.' Indeed, in a subsequent passage Mr. Wilson admits that 'in the axioms of ethics' we are justified in treating free thought as a crime. What is this but to acknowledge that there is in conscience a natural authority against which it is from time to time the temptation of free thought to rebel, and that the transgression results in action which is to be held as no other than a crime? It is true that the supremacy of authority in the department of morals is here based upon 'the enormous mass of observed facts and experience of human nature upon which these axioms rest;' but we cannot suppose that Mr. Wilson really means that the axioms, whether of ethics or of any other science, rest upon experience or induction. Surely the axioms, whether of morals or of mathematics, are antecedent, not subsequent to induction. We cannot, therefore, withdraw from the position of our former article, that there is an authority in conscience—and in revelation also when once recognized as such—which we affirm to be natural; and an authority in creeds and constitutions, civil or ecclesiastical, which we cannot describe as wholly artificial; and that between these and free thought there is apt to arise a sharp and dangerous collision. Happy is it alike for truth and for mankind where this collision is avoided. But for this it is evident that calmness, discretion, and a wise self-restraint are eminently needful.

Let it be said, in starting, that in advocating the claims of authority we are proposing no novel or artificial principle. It has its roots in human nature and in the constitution of things—

'For out of the old fieldes, as men saith,
Cometh al this newe corne fro' yere to yere;
And out of olde bokes, in good faith,
Cometh all this newe science that men love.'

So sung Chaucer five centuries ago, bearing curious witness to the ancient rivalry of which we write. Not in religion only, but in law, in medicine, in every fine art, and even in the schools of science itself, the voice of authority is necessarily heard. It asserts its rights in every branch of education.

Wherever men are compelled to resort to others of more complete instruction or of wider experience, there the principle is acknowledged. When an expert in some special branch of knowledge is called in to the assistance of a court of justice the very majesty of law bends its ear and stoops to receive a lesson from authority less exalted than its own.

It may, however, be objected that in the case of religion the analogy does not hold: that the interest is so personal, and the responsibility so direct, that herein a man can admit no master and be bound by no dictum. No cry has ever been so popular as that of religious liberty, even when it has been held to include the liberty of repudiating religion altogether. And we so far admit this plea as to acknowledge that whilst in religion a man may well accept the guidance of men wiser and more experienced than himself, there can be but one authority to which he is bound to submit absolutely and without reserve, and that is the Voice of God Himself.

When God spake to Abraham and the prophets it was by a clear sensible impression made upon the soul, distinct and unmistakable as the voice of man to man. How such an impression was conveyed, how the mind became conscious of the Divine communications, and able to distinguish them from all other utterances, is a mystery which we cannot fathom; but sure we are that were we to become thus distinctly conscious of the Divine Voice, our duty would be implicit submission, whether of the intellect or of the will. A command so authenticated must claim our obedience, however contrary to our inclination; a revelation so guaranteed must receive our assent, how far soever removed from our intelligence. The only question which can arise will be as to the source from which the intimation reaches us. If once that source be ascertained to be Divine its authority must be binding and absolute. The real question, then, is, Does Almighty God thus communicate to mankind the truths of His Being and the injunctions of His Will? Is there still heard upon the earth that Sovereign Voice to which all must bow? Or has God indeed 'left Himself without a witness,' and for all that is spiritual and immortal created man 'for naught'? We maintain that God does thus speak; that the Divine Voice is still heard in the conscience, in Holy Scripture, in the Church. Not that the Divine revelation is made in each of these in the same way, nor in every case with the same distinctness, but still in each one with such measure of distinctness, and with such adaptation to our capacity, as to demand our reverent attention, and to minister directly to our guidance alike in

thor
por
Hol
each
app
with
obs
scie
that
few
mat
Chu
can
well
han
Sim
essen
cons
dire
puls
A
ally
thos
deck
liabi
upor
most
dress
ofte
Intel
rema
creat
ced
consc
will
consc
ness
N
revel
with
dispo
not g
that
other

thought and action. And here let us premise one most important consideration.

It will be observed that we have claimed for conscience, Holy Scripture, and the Church, an authority paramount for each in its own sphere, and this notwithstanding that our apprehension of each may be in its measure fallible, and notwithstanding that the Voice may in each case be at times obscure, at times misunderstood. For we admit that conscience may be imperfectly developed or wrongly instructed; that Holy Scripture may be at times obscure, and in some few passages of uncertain authenticity; that occasionally in matters of doctrine, certainly in matters of practice, individual Churches may err and have erred. It is no less wise than candid to make such an admission at the outset, for we are well aware that sooner or later it will be demanded at our hands. Yet, after all, to what does this admission amount? Simply to this, *that the claim to infallibility is in no way essential to the claim of authority*, and, in fact, is rather inconsistent with it; for the sensible presence of an infallible director would amount to little else than a physical compulsion.

An infallible guide in opinion or in action, to be effectually such, implies a corresponding intelligence on the part of those who are to submit to its direction, for if the infallible declarations be imperfectly understood the result is evidently liability to error. In vain do the most exquisite harmonies fall upon an ear incapable of appreciating them; in vain are the most complete demonstrations of most accurate science addressed to a mind unprepared to receive them. We have often doubted whether it were possible even for the Divine Intelligence to communicate to the mind of man, whilst it remains such as it is, any true conception of the mysteries of creation, much less of the countless æons by which it was preceded. And when it is stated that God speaks to man in conscience, it is yet conceded that such revelation of Himself will be more or less distinct, and more or less complete as conscience is trained by instruction or quickened in sensitiveness by moral culture.

Nor do we for a moment lose sight of the fact that the revelation of Divine truth in Holy Scripture addresses itself with very different degrees of distinctness to minds differently disposed to receive it; that it requires study, which some cannot give at all, and the great majority but most imperfectly; that its several parts stand in very varied relations to each other and to the student. Nor, on the other hand, do we

forget that the Church is comprised of men who bring into her synods the idiosyncrasies of race, of country, and of character, and who are not altogether free from temper, or prejudice, or affection. All this we are willing to acknowledge and to take account of; but, all this notwithstanding, we still assert that each is rightly invested with a just authority, which may claim to regulate both practice and opinion, an authority which is in some cases absolute, in others of legitimate weight proportionate to the circumstances and to the occasion.

Of the authority of conscience in determining philosophical modes of thought we have already spoken at such length that we shall not pursue the subject any further at present. Suffice it to say that so long as we acknowledge the existence of those moral instincts which the more thoughtful and more reasonable of sceptics themselves allow, there is at once a limit to those speculations which question or deny the existence and authority of God or the moral distinctions of right or wrong. The Atheist, the Pantheist, and the Positivist alike offend the moral instincts of our nature, and are condemned by anticipation *in foro conscientia*.

We turn to the later branch of our subject, the claims of Scripture, and of the Church to determine or to influence religious belief.

And herein it is obvious that we limit our subject importantly as regards the section of mankind to whom this authority extends. Whilst the authority of conscience is universal, and extends to all mankind, that of Scripture and the Church reaches to Christians only, or to those to whom Christianity is offered. The authority of conscience is what Mr. Wilson would designate as 'natural;' that of Scripture and of the Church not indeed, to use his other expression, 'artificial,' but limited and to a certain extent derived.

So intimately, at least in our view, are these last two connected that it is difficult to separate absolutely between them; they are co-ordinate institutions of the grace of God, and exercise co-ordinate jurisdiction in the dispensation of that grace. They are thus connected by the closest ties. Whilst the Church is the Divinely constituted witness to Holy Scripture, and whilst to her charge are committed the oracles of God, in Holy Scripture is found the rule and measure of the Church's faith. Nor do we admit for a moment that we argue in a vicious circle when we add that they are in no small measure mutually dependent; that whilst Scripture rests greatly, though not solely, upon the testimony of the Church, the Church rests largely, but not exclusively,

upon the foundations of Scripture. Why may not two co-ordinate institutions find corroboration each in the other? Of course, were either exclusively dependent upon the testimony of the other, there would be force in the oft-repeated insinuation; but so long as both Scripture and the Church rest primarily upon their own historical evidence, their mutual corroboration is of the highest possible value, and as convincing as testimony can be. We wonder what would be said if this were wanting; if in Scripture were no history of the Church, and in the Church no witness to Scripture actually embedded in its constitution. It would be represented, and not unreasonably, as an insuperable difficulty, and the very independence of the two would be asserted to be destructive of both.

To these, their mutual relations, we shall recur by-and-by. At present let us fix our attention for a short time upon the claim of Scripture upon our acceptance and submission.

First of all it is here, and here alone, that we meet with a conception of the Divine Being and of the relations in which He stands to His creatures in any degree worthy of Him, or such as can satisfy the quickened and elevated sensibilities of the soul of man. We are ready enough to acknowledge that to this conception must belong every virtue raised to its highest pitch of excellence. We confess that to construct an ideal from the combination of all human qualities is but an anthropomorphic effort unworthy of Him whose image we would create; yet for all this before Scripture dawned upon the world mankind succeeded only in representing their deities as brutal or grotesque. They attributed immoralities instead of virtues to their divinities, or, incapable of imagining the combination of superhuman qualities, they created a separate deity for each attribute, and destroyed its beauty by its isolation. If Vulcan was superendowed with strength he certainly lacked the grace of Apollo; if Venus shone prominent in beauty, she certainly was lamentably deficient in the chastity of Diana or the intellectual brilliancy of Minerva. The religion which commenced in a deification of the powers of nature, often in the grossest form, found its consummation in a burlesque of human social life, often in an exaggeration of its vice and cruelty. The publication of Holy Scripture to the world was coincident with the decline of the empire, with the worship of Serapis, with the deification of Tiberius. Whence, then, this pure and holy conception of the Most High God, of Him that inhabiteth eternity, who is of purer eyes than to look upon iniquity? The Sermon upon the Mount

was republished to the world when Greece was sunk in infamy and Rome in blood. Whence, then, the glorious code of the Beatitudes, the sublime description of that which characterizes the saints of God, and of that which constitutes their blessedness? The Epistles were written in the days of bitter persecution, when men had given up all hope and suicide was the one solace of a philosophy which had surrendered itself to despair. Whence, then, this new hope, this faith in God, this trust in good? The annals of Tacitus are a wondrous commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, the rapture of S. Stephen's martyrdom a most strange contrast to the utter despondency in which men like Seneca opened their veins that they might die.

Or perhaps we may be told that these loftier conceptions of God, of duty, of immortality, are of 'Semitic origin,' as though the phenomenon were purely ethnological, or its cogency could be escaped by clothing it in scientific terms. But the fact is thus only re-stated; it is not explained. Why are the Hebrews thus in advance of all mankind? For if other Orientals do perhaps show some traces of more spiritual, because more abstract, conceptions of Deity, surely it will not calmly be maintained that the Hebrew Scriptures are not immeasurably in advance of their dreamy mysticism. A single passage here and there is quoted with admiration, if it bear some faint, we will not say forced, resemblance to some precept of the law or some doctrine of the Gospel; but it is not denied that God did not leave Himself without a witness even outside the limits of His special revelation. Indeed, what has been said above of the voice of God in conscience would imply so much. The nations of the world have ever been 'feeling after God, if haply they might find Him,' and often to their earnest search some glimpses of Divine light, some foretastes of Divine truth, have been vouchsafed. But flashes like these were, in comparison with the steady and progressive light of revelation, like the shooting of a meteor across a midnight sky as compared with the steady growth of day at sunrise.

But it is not only in the loftier and purer conceptions of God that the Scriptures carry the conviction of their Divine origin; it is a trite and common thing to say that they alone give a sublime yet sober estimate of man's nature and his destiny. We do not forget the hero-worship of antiquity, nor the extravagant adulation paid to some, and those by no means the most worthy, individuals of the race; but human nature gained little in the deification of strength in Hercules,

188
still
dign
exte
spec
a cy
mar
One
scri
whic
inve
The
sign
its e
V
hum
in th
activ
the
whic
homo
great
upon
and
whic
In a
to tes
it be
tual
whic
as ju
serva
down
homa
conce
moral
that
comm
such
the m
just
person
liest
and tr
solves
ful my
VOL

still less in the apotheosis of empire in the Cæsars. The dignity of mankind was perhaps raised to an infinitesimal extent when a few philosophers expatiated in the porch, or speculated in the grove, to conclude in a dreamy agnosticism, a cynical despair of truth. What, meanwhile, of the masses of mankind, those '*fruges consumere nati*,' the poor, the slaves? One or two out of the million might wear the purple or inscribe his pedigree on marble columns, but it was Christianity which told the meanest that he was the 'child of God' and invested him with the true nobility of the Divine Image. There is doubtless a strange irony, but there is a deep significance beside, in that proud humility which emblazons its escutcheon with the Cross.

Very interesting is it to reflect upon the attitude of the human intellect in the presence of Holy Scripture. Indeed, in the instances of men of greater intellectual cultivation and activity approaching the Bible for the first time, apart from the reverential training and from that implicit acceptance which is the result of early Christian education in a Christian home, this attitude is of still greater interest, as it is of still greater difficulty. The mental powers are necessarily called upon to decide questions of authenticity and interpretation, and of that relative weight and authority of the several parts which comes under the head of the 'Proportion of Faith.' In a word, in such a case the critical faculty is first employed to test the claims of revelation and to 'try the Spirit whether it be of God;' and this task accomplished, the whole intellectual man bends in humility to accept that Divine Word upon which in certain external points it has been compelled to sit as judge. The attitude of such a mind is like that of a loyal servant who has recognized his prince in disguise, and kneels down in lowliest reverence and deepest love to do him homage. Here, and here alone, he finds the pure and holy conception of a Personal God, he meets with a standard of morals absolutely pure whilst absolutely unselfish, and finds that standard presented not alone in a code of positive commands, but in an Exemplar of surpassing excellence, such as engages the obedience of mankind not alone by the motives of a just and reasonable fear and a no less just and reasonable hope, but by those of the strongest personal love founded upon the deepest gratitude and lowliest admiration. In a single word, he is met by grace and truth in the Person of Jesus Christ. For him Scripture solves, so far as it can be solved, the great and painful mystery of sin. It offers to his faith the infinite re-

VOL. XVI.—NO. XXXI.

G

sources not of Divine Providence alone—in which, capricious and arbitrary as it appeared to them, the very heathen could repose—but those of Divine grace as well, which is yet a higher and a greater gift. Conscious as he is of an immortal spirit within him, he is here brought into the presence of the Spirit of God. For the first time does he meet with satisfaction for those 'spiritual facts of hope, and aspiration, and worship which admit of no verification but their own.'

In comparison with these its loftier attributes it is perhaps a light thing to speak of Scripture as containing maxims of the deepest practical wisdom and poetical beauties most sublime. It may seem a small thing to mention the exquisite pathos of its narratives and the tender devotion of its hymns; yet by these qualities it establishes and sustains its authority over the intellect as by the others it commands the moral and spiritual man. Cast in a form which is at the least unique in this, that it can interest the unlearned and the child, whilst it can hold captive the scholar, the philosopher, and the divine, none who surrender themselves to its influence can fail to recognize the Voice Divine.

It has, however, been the fashion, especially among recent converts to the Romish Church, to speak with something like scorn of the authority of a 'book;' as though a book even of an uninspired author were not in truth the most careful and measured utterance of the *man*, his most weighty and authoritative word; as though a man's writings did not differ from his conversation in this very particular, that whilst the one is but the reflection of his passing mood, the result of whim or accident, the other is the record of his serious thought and most deliberate conclusions.

Yet still there is, without a doubt, a marked difference, not so much in convincing as in winning and persuasive force, between the written document and the living tongue. Yet even this distinction does not hold good of works of inspiration. In these, though the human writer be dead, yet the living Spirit abides. Both as it is the Eternal Spirit which suggested, and as it is the same Spirit which interprets it, the word of God in Holy Scripture is never a 'caput mortuum.' Its essential and unalterable character is that it is the living oracle: *ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργής*. The devout student finds himself in the presence of a living Instructor. There is a power underlying the written volume which is felt to be not that of Truth alone, but of Life also. *Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ζῶσποιεῖ*. And it is because the creating and informing Spirit of Holy Scripture is thus infinite and Divine that the spirit of

the 1
yet g
stirs
all v
the st
with
region
of tha
horize
Isaiah
of Da
God.
music
the e
facult
B
book
endur
God.
to be
we ar
more
stood.
envel
velop
upon
form
faith;
point
truth.
Ap
Script
world
and n
truths
as ad
by ora
of the
the d
creed,
consti
in mar
on rec
W
truth,

the learner can neither exhaust the stores of its wisdom nor yet give full expression to the deep spiritual motions which it stirs within. Who has not felt that at the very point where all verbal commentaries and illustrations fail there come in the strains of some great musician, not indeed as commensurate with Holy Scripture, but as leading the soul far beyond the regions of express thought and placing it upon the confines of that world alike of perception and of emotion which has no horizon? This is why Handel is so true an interpreter of Isaiah both in his pathos and in his majesty, and Mendelssohn of David in the deep trust of his soul and his confidence in God. This is why the strains of the Messiah are more than music, and the air 'O rest in the Lord' comes to the soul as the expression of that for which human language has no faculty of utterance.

But if Holy Scripture be indeed written in a book that book does not stand alone, but exists in necessary and enduring relation to a Living Body, the Church of the Living God. We are very anxious to state clearly what we believe to be the true relations between these two, and this because we are convinced that there never was a time when it was more important that these relations should be distinctly understood. Various unhappy circumstances have combined to envelope this subject in prejudice. The unwarrantable developments of the Church of Rome have brought discredit upon the very word 'tradition,' as though tradition in some form or other were not an inseparable condition of a historic faith; and the controversies which have gathered round this point have not failed to rouse passions little favourable to truth.

Again, it has not been sufficiently observed that *Holy Scripture was in no single portion addressed directly to the world at large*, but invariably to those in covenant with God and members of His Church; that consequently the great truths of revelation are stated rather incidentally than directly, as addressed to those who were already instructed in them by oral communication; and that therefore it became the duty of the Church to summarize and to formulate them. Thus the dictum of Chillingworth left the Protestant without a creed, and placed upon Scripture a strain which it was not constituted to bear. How lamentable the result has been in many once orthodox communities we do not care to place on record.

We would therefore lay it down as a most important truth, that whilst the Church is the Divinely constituted

witness and guardian of Scripture, in Scripture is found the rule and measure of the Church's faith. Let it not be supposed that these are loose or arbitrary terms. Holy Scripture supplies the rule by which the faith is to be regulated, and the measure by which, as necessary to salvation, it is to be limited; but, on the other hand, it is not, except in a very qualified sense, the source from which it is originally derived. Written documents were not the original mode of the Divine communications to the Church or to the world. It was to the Church that the successive revelations of His Being and His Will were primarily addressed by Almighty God, and that by the living agency of inspired men, whether patriarchs, lawgivers, prophets, or apostles. Holy Scripture embodies and transmits these revelations, and with them she incorporates the history of that Church in its development from an individual into a family and nation, as the guardian and depository of the truths thus progressively revealed. Hence, among other causes, arises the varied structure of Holy Scripture, and the confessedly different relations in which its several parts stand to the soul of man. The often-disputed question whether the Bible 'be' or 'contain' the Word of God arises really from forgetfulness of the difference in these relations. The writings of prophets, evangelists, and apostles convey that very revelation which it has pleased God to make. The historians of Scripture convey the history of that Church which was the depository of the truth, in which history is found the guarantee of the authenticity of the revelation. No one will suppose that the books of Numbers and of Esther stand in the same relation to the soul of man as the Gospel of S. John or the Epistles of S. Paul, nor that a man's faith is affected in the same way by each. But the books of Numbers and of Esther stand in very important relation to those spiritual truths which immediately and vitally affect the soul; they are the history of the casket in which the jewel was enshrined, and that history is preserved to us in the special providence and care of God. It may be a matter of small importance to the individual Christian whether the length of the court of the tabernacle was an hundred cubits, nor is he specially interested in the succession of courses of the priesthood; but it is of the greatest importance to him to know that both under Moses and under Solomon provision was made for the continuous worship of Almighty God, and for the maintenance of sacrifice and offering in perpetual anticipation of the one true Sacrifice by the one great High Priest. The number of the armies of David or the years of

Hez-
but
main-
whic-
be fo-
instr-
truth-
story-
man-
S
const-
The
main-
isolat-
it for-
it had-
Chris-
mirac-
posse-
'prea-
their
They
patria-
and
faith.
out t-
now o-
It
from
Jewis-
receiv-
oral t-
succes-
sacran-
of tra-
Script-
was co-
It
Churc-
measu-
Churc-
as a g-
search-
perple-
in no

Hezekiah may seem trivial circumstances in a Divine record ; but it is a matter of most serious interest to know how was maintained the continuity of that Church and kingdom in which Isaiah prophesied and the Psalmists sung. Nor is it to be forgotten how much the historical narrative and the spiritual instruction interpenetrate each other, and how the deepest truths are frequently conveyed in that concrete form of personal story which is most readily apprehended by the masses of mankind.

Such, then, on the whole, and broadly speaking, is the constitution of Scripture which is the Church's heritage. The Church, thus armed and thus instructed, God first maintained in a certain isolation in the world's midst—an isolation essential to the purity of its growth—and then sent it forth into the world to proclaim that truth which hitherto it had retained enshrined in its own bosom. Then did the Christian Church appear among mankind, the creation of a miraculous history, equipped with miraculous powers, in possession of supernatural truth. They who went forth thus, 'preaching the kingdom,' were themselves inspired men ; and their inspiration was attested by their supernatural powers. They were the descendants of a lofty lineage. Prophets and patriarchs, 'the friends of God,' had been their forefathers, and had transmitted to them the precious heritage of the faith. The golden chain had stretched in bright links throughout the world's history from Abraham to S. John, and was now complete in the revelation of the Son of God.

It was not then, we repeat, from inspired writings, but from inspired men, that the Church, whether Christian or Jewish, first received her doctrine. And this doctrine, thus received, she diffused by living agency, transmitting it by oral teaching, by liturgical acts, by creeds, by her ministerial succession, and above all by the unbroken testimony of her sacraments. But simultaneously with all these varied methods of transmission she has ever carried in her hand the Holy Scriptures as the rule and measure of that truth which she was commissioned to teach.

It is to this co-ordinate authority of Scripture and the Church that we would urge that no scant or grudging measure of allegiance is due. Not to the members of the Church of England alone would we commend this authority as a guide, but indeed to all who in this our land are painfully searching for truth and sorely vexed by the intellectual perplexities of the day. We desire to deal with this subject in no frigid or pedantic spirit. We can understand that

hopeful enthusiasm for which the freest speculation has the greatest charms, to which thought is attractive in proportion as it is daring, and for which in this, as in other fields of adventure, danger is a leading element of fascination. Still more deeply can we sympathize with the tender and affectionate spirit which clings to the traditions of the past and is won by all that woos in the name of antiquity. But the issues here are far too important to be left to mere feeling to choose, or to the chance proclivities of intellectual taste to decide. Too often have we seen the keen and self-reliant enthusiasm which had launched itself without chart or compass upon the wide sea of speculation return with sails drooping and spars broken, despairing of the truth which it had failed to discover. Too often, on the other hand, has it been shown by sad experience that religious convictions require to rest upon more solid foundations than those of sentiment in an age of scepticism. In fact, alike in the one case and the other, the mind requires something definite and tangible to grasp. Antiquity is a term well-nigh as vague as speculation itself. It floats through fifteen centuries at least, and ranges from S. Clement to the latest of the schoolmen. Thus in its very grandeur it vanishes into a shadow; in addition to which, whilst all which harmonizes with our taste or appeals to our judgment may very properly influence our opinions, that which is to exercise authority must show somewhat of right, for it claims not only to influence but to control.

Now, the scope and comprehensiveness of Scripture is happily not difficult to determine. No practical inquirer for truth need distress himself with questions of authenticity, nor embarrass himself at starting with the settlement of the canon. The literary history of isolated passages, or even of a single book, will not substantially affect the foundations of his faith; nor, with regard to important doctrines, need he be perplexed by variations either of readings or of translations. Yet the student will undoubtedly feel that the leading articles of the faith, though abundantly implied, are yet but seldom explicitly stated, and scarcely ever, if at all, scientifically formulated. The explanation has been already suggested. Those to whom Scripture was given were already orally instructed; and it is an absolute necessity of catechetical instruction that the truths thus taught should have been formulated to their hands. It is impossible to conceive them otherwise taught or otherwise learned. Do then, we naturally ask, these formulated statements actually remain to us? If

they do they will determine the true sense of Scripture, and they will themselves be illustrated, amplified, and at the same time limited by Scripture.

The answer is plain. We have them first of all, and most explicitly, in the primitive creeds—in the Apostles', the Nicene, and though perhaps not with such formal authentication, yet certainly as representing the primitive faith, in the doctrinal portions of the Athanasian Creed. We find them next—as, should opportunity offer, we hope to show on another occasion—in the two great sacraments of the Gospel, maintained in unbroken continuity and embodying in distinct acts unintermitting testimony to Christian doctrine. We find them accordingly in the most ancient liturgies, and more particularly in those most interesting fragments of liturgical formularies embedded here and there in the Epistles of S. Paul; as, for example, in certain well-known doxologies, and in those *πίστοι λόγοι* which occur so remarkably in the pastoral Epistles. Nay, we are not in truth straining the case if we add the testimony of the catacombs, the language of rude symbol and untutored painting, in which antiquity speaks in perhaps her most pathetic accents. It was this combination, if we may not rather say this identity of primitive faith with Scriptural statement, which formed the ideal to which the Church of England strove to return at the Reformation. The religious aspect of that movement has been much obscured by the personal and political character of the successive governments under which it was effected, and still more seriously by the iconoclastic violence of the Puritan movement which succeeded. We are convinced that the unmeasured vituperation of such a work as Mr. Ward's once famous *Ideal* was founded largely upon misconception, and would have been obviated by a more patient investigation of the religious history of the sixteenth and preceding centuries. It would have been found that the principles upon which the English Church was re-settled were very far removed from those of the Puritan faction, which were, in fact, no other than the dictum of Chillingworth carried out to its extreme consequences. In the liturgy as in the constitution of the Church of England it is impossible not to recognize a most conscientious effort to conform to primitive models, as, for example, in the return—for such it was—to the vernacular, in the restoration of the cup to the laity; above all, in the embodiment in the liturgy of the true doctrine of the sacraments, the real gift of regeneration in baptism, the real conveyance of the grace of the Body and Blood of Christ in the

Eucharist, notwithstanding all the pressure which must from time to time have been brought to bear in an opposite direction.¹ Surely this marked conformity in great doctrines and on great principles is not materially affected by the transposition of a sentence or a change in the accessories of worship.

Nor can we refrain from noticing here an obligation which we owe to the compilers of our liturgy which will, we are convinced, be recognized much more distinctly hereafter than at present. We refer to the fact that these great truths are there expressed mainly in the majestic simplicity of Scriptural language rather than, as, humanly speaking, might so easily have happened, in the terms of a metaphysical philosophy, terms which themselves tend rapidly to become obsolete as the philosophical system itself shall change or pass away. A difficulty might very conceivably have arisen analogous to that which at the present moment would have been so grievously felt, had the Church been committed to a physical system of the universe or to a special theory of inspiration. We do not think that this point has received as yet by any means the attention which it deserves, though the general subject was referred to in a brief but very striking speech by the Bishop of Peterborough at the Church Congress at Leicester, 1880.

It will be observed that the views here propounded are wholly at variance with any system of doctrinal development, *i.e.* of development within the Church of doctrine as distinguished from opinion. That there must be a constant development of opinion, that even doctrinal statements must vary even as philosophical systems and modes of thought vary, is obvious. New theories will arise; old theories will either disappear or adapt themselves to new circumstances; the spiritual conceptions of a cultivated age will differ essentially from those of a barbarous one, as the sunlight will be refracted in different colours as falling through different media; but the sunlight is not changed, nor are the truths of revelation changed. They are immutable and eternal. If the Romish Communion has defined such doctrines as those of

¹ We cannot refrain from quoting some remarkable words of Cardinal Newman (*Parochial Sermons*, vol. iii.) on the visible Church. 'If a man looks into the Prayer Book he will meet there with names about which he knows and cares nothing at all. A prayer we read daily is called the prayer of S. Chrysostom; a creed is called the Creed of S. Athanasius; another creed is called the Nicene Creed. In the Articles we read of S. Augustine and S. Jerome, in the Homilies of many such beside.'

the Immaculate Conception, the Papal Supremacy, &c., and have constituted these definitions *de fide*, it seems to us that she has manifestly exceeded her powers and strained authority beyond its just limits. If our estimate of the Church's office as the witness and custodian of truth be correct, her authority to impose articles *de fide* must be limited to that faith which the Apostles taught and which the Apostolic Church received, or at the least cannot extend beyond the immediate and most necessary deductions. The results of the recent policy of the Church of Rome have yet to be seen. We imagine that they are contemplated with no small apprehension by some of her wisest leaders.

But to return to our own Church. The position which she has in our opinion so wisely taken in this respect supplies no inconsiderable answer to an argument which a recent article in a popular periodical has put forward in the interests of infidelity, and which was used, if we are not mistaken, by Mr. Mallock in his book *Is Life Worth Living?* in the interests of Romanism.

'If,' says Mr. Kegan Paul, 'you are unwilling to accept the extreme dogmas of the Church of Rome, how can you consistently accept the not less mysterious doctrines of the Christian faith?' 'If,' on the other hand, argues Mr. Mallock, 'you are willing to bend the intellect to faith, and to accept the mysteries of revelation, why do you not go further and, by a like submission, accept the not more mysterious doctrines of the Church of Rome?' We say nothing of the moral character of such a dilemma. To us the argument, in whichever direction it is pressed, seems much worse than illogical: it is a cruel attempt to wreck men's faith upon the horns of an unsound dilemma. But the argument is fallacious, and the dilemma is apparent only. It is true that Scripture and the primitive faith involve certain mysteries which confessedly transcend our reason; but they come to us on the strength of a revelation contained in written documents, contemporaneous with the inspired men who taught them and whose inspiration was attested by their lives and by their miracles. Subsequent ages have added other dogmas by way either of development or accretion. Of many of these it cannot be said that they are primitive, as it cannot be said that they are Scriptural. They rest upon a later and a different authority, which we may term ecclesiastical; but even so not upon the authority of the undivided Church. It is then argued that a man must either be a Romanist and accept all, or an infidel and reject all. This is maintained, as we have said, on the

one hand in the interests of Rome, on the other in those of infidelity. It is a dilemma to which the Ultramontanists have endeavoured to reduce Continental society, and with success; only that society has embraced the alternative for which the Ultramontanist was unprepared, and has become infidel instead of Romanist. But this is illogical of society, which ought to have seen that to receive a Divine mystery upon evidence Divinely authenticated is quite a different thing from receiving an ecclesiastical mystery upon no proper evidence at all. What may be the effects of such a strain placed upon authority in the Vatican Council time alone will show; but the indications which are already discernible in the condition of Continental society are not in any degree encouraging.

Surely we have reason to be thankful that the Church of England has imposed no such dilemma upon the thought of the nation. If she err at present it certainly is not in the direction of excessive stringency. The terms of subscription for her clergy are as free as is consistent with any *bonâ fide* adherence to primitive doctrine, whilst the terms of communion for her laity are those of the Nicene Creed. The doctrinal statements of her liturgical offices are for the most part in the express words of Scripture, or such as are demonstrable from Scripture as read in the light of primitive antiquity. So far as they are otherwise she does not impose them as *de fide*. At the same time there are few, if any, important doctrinal questions upon which her views are not distinctly known. Upon such points of doctrine or of practice as have not arisen subsequent to her reconstitution at the Reformation her voice is abundantly explicit to guide thought, to teach, to influence, to direct opinion; but beyond those truths which she holds upon no insufficient evidence to constitute the primitive revelation of God she does not presume to bind men's consciences. Doubtless there will not be wanting some who fain would have it otherwise, who will sigh for an authority at once more stringent and more comprehensive; to whom the labour of thought is painful, whilst the attitude of suspense is distressing in the extreme; to whom it would seem like an inexpressible relief to surrender once for all the right, and to escape for ever the responsibility of thought. In the interest of such we may have a word by-and-by. We are not optimists. We do not hold that the position of the Church of England with respect to what we may call secondary, though most important, truths is by any means satisfactory; but as to the eternal verities of the faith we do maintain that neither is her utterance indistinct nor her authority obscure.

Me
hun
sinc
eve
of
bet
itse
Sun
be,
is it
asc
of v
Fra
has
too
una
See
of a
of a
way
from
mur
rela
Pius
rela
dec
that
weig
encu
clad
who
woul
fath
from
the
Wor
stit
retai

it may
to lea
Thos
libera
meas

Meanwhile we are looking forward to a struggle such as human society has not seen for many a year, certainly not since the closing decade of the last century, nor in England even then. The struggle will be not between opposing views of Christian truth, not between rival sects or Churches, but between faith and no faith, between Christianity and Atheism itself. The feud is deadly, and internecine will be the strife. Surely it is our wisdom to concentrate our forces, and it may be, for a season, even to contract our frontier. But above all it is necessary that we carefully reconnoitre our position, and ascertain distinctly the authority which we follow and in virtue of which, in turn, we claim to lead. On the Continent, in France, in Italy, the war has already commenced. Infidelity has allied itself with democracy, and democracy has been only too ready to accept the alliance. How plaintive, yet how unavailing, are the appeals which each day brings from the See of Rome to the Powers of Europe by the re-establishment of authority to reconstitute society! Alas! the very principle of authority has been strained till it threatens utterly to give way. The contest is carried on at a terrible disadvantage, from the utter confusion which prevails in the Roman Communion as to the seat and the limits of authority and its relations to intellect and conscience. The encyclical of Pius IX. and the Vatican decrees are powerless to settle these relations. They have practically decided nothing: their decisions fall upon hearts that are unmoved and upon minds that are unconvinced. The Church comes into the fray weighted with a mass of mediævalism which checks and encumbers her at every move. She is like the stripling David clad in Saul's armour, but she dares not throw it aside. Yet who does not see the freedom and the strength which she would gain would she return to the position of the Nicæan fathers, enforcing that only as of faith which they 'received from the Church and proved from Scripture,' standing upon the impregnable foundation of primitive doctrine and of the Word of God?¹

'Although Christ,' said the Council of Constance, 'instituted the Sacrament in both kinds and the primitive Church retained the same method of administering it, yet *these things*

¹ We quote the words of the late Provost of Oriel. His was a mind, it may be, too strictly accurate and measured in thought enthusiastically to lead mankind, but on that very account well qualified to instruct them. Those who best knew him can testify to that kindness and unflinching liberality which no less strongly marked his character than did the calm, measured intellect, so judicially exact alike in thought and in expression.

notwithstanding, tamen hoc non obstante . . . Daring words, and terrible to reflect upon. Yet who that knows the history of the Council of Constance will not feel that their dread Nemesis yet hangs like a dark cloud over the hosts of battle? Let the Church but take her stand upon the distinct ground of the Divine revelation, and the ultimate victory is assured. It is a trite maxim, 'Magna est veritas.' But of all truth none is so great as the truth of God: against that it is that the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not counsel the surrender of a single truth; we do not urge the sacrifice of one cherished conviction. There are doctrines not directly included in the creeds which the Church of Christ holds with scarcely less affection, and for which her children have been willing to suffer persecution. The question is not whether she shall surrender these, or whether her children shall cease to hold them, or her clergy cease to teach them; but whether she shall impose them as *de fide*, make them terms of communion, or exact them as essential to the faith. Yet with respect to these, which we may term secondary truths, the Church has both a right and a duty, and it is right that her voice should be distinctly heard. For it is her province not only to lay down the essential articles of faith, but to guide opinion, to educate thought, and to set true and sound views of spiritual mysteries before mankind. She will thus have a distinctive theology, having regard to the genius of her children and to the subjects and modes of thought current at any given time. In the sixteenth century the Church of England had to speak on many subjects of secondary importance which yet pressed severely upon men's consciences and most closely affected the wellbeing of society. The lawfulness of an oath, the right of a Christian man to separate property, the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy, were a few among many points which at that time agitated men's minds to an extent which now we can hardly realize. The Church was bound to speak, and to speak authoritatively, upon such topics, though not perhaps justified in making them conditions of communion. Time passes on. The centres of interest are displaced. Few question at present the lawfulness of property or of a judicial oath. Other questions arise, not unattended by new dangers: questions of doctrine, questions of ritual, questions of Church government. Men look to the Church for direction; the crisis arrives, perhaps passes away. The Church is silent, to the great detriment of her authority. She has no voice, no legitimate organ for the expression of

her
acco
very
for c
prop
mos
that
ener
civil
fear,
sync
mina
resul
solit
mach
has
cour
have
posit
posit
mod
vain
earn
thing
wish
for h
as sh
turie
expr
abun
coun
contr
is m
sense
great
whils
mana
rank
the C
the fi
a bod
will r
powe
shake
the re

her will or of her convictions. Men act as best they may, in accordance with their interpretation of laws which, from their very age, are often obsolete, always obscure. They are tried for contumacy, and punished with a severity manifestly disproportionate to the offence. Hence arise entanglements of most disastrous kind. And what is the cause? Surely it is that the Church's voice is silenced, that in all the reviving energy of her new vigour she is perforce dumb. Our rulers civil, and it may be ecclesiastical, were afraid, perhaps still fear, that if the Church were allowed free action in her synods, theological disquiet, incessant disputation, the interminable contest of opinions must ensue. What has been the result? There has been more than once much danger of solitude, but has there been peace? In fact, the ecclesiastical machine has been thrown rudely out of gear. Responsibility has constantly been cast upon the wrong shoulders. Law courts, if they have not been compelled to act as legislators, have had to incur the suspicion and obloquy of a false position. Bishops have been placed in no more enviable a position. They have been compelled perpetually to counsel moderation, to urge compromise, to strain authority, in the vain effort to persuade men deeply, it may be unreasonably, earnest in their convictions to acquiesce in a condition of things possible only in a state of torpor. What the Church wished was to be awake—to discuss, to examine, *to decide for herself*. Why should she not legislate for the nineteenth as she had done for the sixteenth century and for the centuries before? No doubt divergencies of opinion would find expression in an ecclesiastical council. They certainly found abundant methods of expression in the abeyance of that council. But in regularly constituted synods they would be controlled by precedent, governed by prescription, and, what is more important still, solemnized and moderated by the sense of responsibility. In irregular warfare the tactics are greatly in the hands of the undisciplined and untrained, whilst in a regularly constituted force the authority and the management will naturally vest in the officers of the highest rank and of the greatest experience. It is time, then, that the Church recover that authority which can attach only to the free expression of her will. There is little danger that in a body constituted like the Church of England prescription will not carry its full weight, unless, indeed, the legislative power be so long delayed that her organization becomes shaken and the temper of her members embittered. That the reconstitution of Convocation would involve many diffi-

culties, that the newly constituted bodies would require wise direction and the leadership of trained and statesmanlike minds—this is obvious enough. But the Church of England has still strength enough successfully to encounter difficulties, and leaders of wise, calm, and statesmanlike capacity have never been wanting in the number of her prelates.

‘Sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus æquor,
Et jam tempus equūm fumantia solvere colla.’

If any ask to what authority we absolutely defer in the essential articles of the Christian faith, our answer is, to the co-ordinate and correlative authority of Holy Scripture and of primitive antiquity. If further asked to what guidance we would turn for direction in arriving at sound conclusions in respect of matters of infinite interest, and it may be of vast importance, though not strictly *de fide*, we turn a reverent and docile ear to the voice of the Church Catholic wherever that may be heard, but more especially to that of our own branch of that Church in her formularies and in our great divines; whilst for that Church we do claim, and as a matter of most urgent need, the power of freely expressing her convictions and her will through the constitutional organs of her synods.

How these may be reconstituted; what voice may be given to the laity; how the different orders of the clergy shall obtain or shall secure their proportionate influence; what shall still remain the legitimate authority of the Crown: these are indeed problems which will be solved only by wise and experienced heads. Let us add, with all respect, they will never be solved by faint or desponding hearts.

1. *Re*
2. *Es*
3. *Le*
4. *Le*
5. *Le*

THE
his m
head
ploye
proper
a life
detail
told
event
of the
chang
stories
hither
certain
the na
good
entert
retreat
reclus
all th

ART. VI.—BISHOP THIRLWALL.

1. *Remains, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall, late Lord Bishop of S. David's.* Edited by J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D. Vol. 1 : Charges delivered between the years 1842 and 1860. Vol. 2 : Charges delivered between the years 1863 and 1872. 8vo. (London, 1877.)
2. *Essays, Speeches, and Sermons.* By CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D., late Lord Bishop of S. David's. Edited by J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D. 8vo. (London, 1880.)
3. *Letters to a Friend.* By CONNOP THIRLWALL, late Lord Bishop of S. David's. Edited by the Very Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. 8vo. (London, 1881.)
4. *Letters, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall, late Lord Bishop of S. David's.* Edited by the Very Rev. J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough, and the Rev. LOUIS STOKES, B.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. With Annotations and Preliminary Memoirs by the Rev. LOUIS STOKES. 8vo. (London, 1881.)
5. *Letters to a Friend.* New Edition. (London, 1882.)

THE friends of Bishop Thirlwall have done scant justice to his memory. The list of works which we have placed at the head of our article shows that three persons have been employed either in editing such of his works as it was thought proper to republish, or in recounting some few particulars of a life which ought, we think, to have been related with greater detail and a more lucid arrangement of materials. We are told by Dean Perowne that 'the Bishop's life was not an eventful life.' It certainly was not, in the ordinary sense of the word, eventful. A biography which relates the ever-changing incidents of a bustling career, spiced with good stories and more or less indiscreet revelations of matters hitherto kept secret, is doubtless a very entertaining, and in a certain sense valuable, production. We think, however, that the narrative of such a life as Bishop Thirlwall's might, in good hands, have been made more valuable and quite as entertaining. It is true that he rarely quitted his peaceful retreat at Abergwili; but, paradoxical as it sounds, he was no recluse. He took part in spirit, if not in bodily presence, in all the important events, political, religious, and literary, of

his time ; and when he chose to break silence in speech or pamphlet no one could command a more undivided attention or exercise a more powerful influence. Those, however, who wish to know what he was must make a conception of him for themselves out of his works, for they will derive but little help from his biographers and editors, if we except the brief but deeply interesting preface written by Dean Perowne. Mr. Stokes, the author of the very meagre thread of narrative which connects together the letters published in 1881, had not the advantage of knowing Bishop Thirlwall personally, and does not appear to have possessed the qualities essential to a biographer. Important events of the Bishop's life are either left altogether unnoticed, or treated so scantily that they might as well have been omitted. It has been stated that Bishop Thirlwall's own dislike of even alluding to past controversies operated as a reason for omitting certain subjects, as, for instance, the Rev. Rowland Williams's letter to him and his reply ; but surely such sentimental considerations ought not to have been allowed to interfere with the completeness of an historic picture. Dean Perowne tells us in his preface that the materials for the biography are 'scanty and imperfect.' This good-natured effort to save the character of his colleague only serves to bring out more clearly the unfitness of the latter for the task which he undertook. The scantiness of the materials rendered it all the more necessary that the editor should have made the most of those submitted to him—should have used every care in illustrating them, and should have supplemented them with all the information attainable in the way of dates, references, and the like. This view of his duties does not seem to have presented itself to Mr. Stokes. Again, we may ask, why did not Dean Stanley, at whose suggestion Mr. Stokes was employed, collaborate with him? We can conceive no reason for publishing the *Letters to a Friend* in a separate volume, and many for inserting them in their proper place in the other series. They deal with no distinct class of subject ; but, on the contrary, elucidate many points left obscure in the volume published in the following year, and which seems to have been intended as the final *Life and Letters* of the Bishop. His life, as we understand the word, has yet to be written ; and we fear death has removed most of those who could perform the task in a manner worthy of the subject. For ourselves, all that we propose to do is to try to set forth his talents and his character, by the help of the materials before us, and of such personal recollections as we have been able to gather together.

fath
Cha
Step
Lon
no
ferr
hus
to
She
a b
chil
volu
Sub
Thir
date
the

his p
extra
to sta
was t
ease
time
Gree
positi
stanc
write
autho
hand
remo
time
Life."
which
chose
from

V
serm
select
(Isaia
tion
Janua
begin

VO

Connop Thirlwall was born February 11, 1797. His father, the Rev. Thomas Thirlwall, minister of Tavistock Chapel, Broad Court, Long Acre, Lecturer of S. Dunstan, Stepney, and chaplain to the celebrated Thomas Percy, Lord Bishop of Dromore, resided at Mile End. We can give no information about him except the above list of his preferences; and of Connop's mother we only know that her husband describes her as 'pious and virtuous,' and anxious to 'promote the temporal and eternal welfare' of her children. She had the satisfaction of living long enough to see her son a bishop.¹ Connop must have been a fearfully precocious child. In 1809 the fond father published a small duodecimo volume entitled '*Primitiæ; or, Essays and Poems on Various Subjects, Religious, Moral, and Entertaining*.' By Connop Thirlwall, eleven years of age.' The first of these essays is dated 'June 30, 1804. Seven years old;' and in the preface the father tells us—

'In the short sketch which I shall take of the young author, and his performance, I mean not to amuse the reader with anecdotes of extraordinary precocity of genius; it is, however, but justice to him to state, that at a very *early* period he read English so well that he was taught Latin at three years of age, and at four read Greek with an ease and fluency which astonished all who heard him. From that time he has continued to improve himself in the knowledge of the Greek, Latin, French, and English languages. His talent for composition appeared at the age of seven, from an accidental circumstance. His mother, in my absence, desired his elder brother to write his thoughts upon a subject for his improvement, when the young author took it into his head to ask her permission to take the pen in hand too. His request was of course complied with, without the most remote idea he could write an intelligible sentence, when in a short time he composed that which is first printed, "On the Uncertainty of Life." From that time he was encouraged to cultivate a talent of which he gave so flattering a promise, and generally on a Sunday chose a subject from Scripture. The following essays are selected from those lucubrations.'

We will quote a passage from one of these childish sermons, written when he was eight years old. The text selected is, 'Behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years' (Isaiah xlii. 6); and, after some commonplaces on the condition of Hezekiah, the author takes occasion from the day, January 1, 1806, to make the following reflections:—

'I shall now consider what resolutions we ought to form at the beginning of a new year. The intention of God in giving us life was

¹ *Letters, &c.*, p. 177.

that we might live a life of righteousness. The same ever is His intention in preserving it. We ought, then, to live in righteousness and obey the commandments of God. Do we not perceive that another year is come, that time is passing away quickly, and eternity is approaching? and shall we be all this while in a state of sin, without any recollection that the kingdom of heaven is nearer at hand? But we ought, in the beginning of a new year, to form a resolution to be more mindful of the great account we must give at the last day, and live accordingly: we ought to form a resolution to reform our lives, and walk in the ways of God's righteousness; to abhor all the lusts of the flesh, and to live in temperance; and resolve no more to offend and provoke God with our sins, but repent of them. In the beginning of a new year we should reflect a little: although we are kept alive, yet many died in the course of last year; and this ought to make us watchful.

There is not much originality of thought in this; indeed, it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the paternal sermons, to which the author doubtless listened every Sunday, suggested the form, and possibly the matter, of these essays. What meaning could a child of eight attach to such expressions as 'the lusts of the flesh,' or 'repentance,' or 'eternity'? Still, notwithstanding this evident imitation of others in the matter, the style has a remarkable individuality. Indeed, just as the portrait of the child which is prefixed to the volume recalls forcibly the features of the veteran Bishop at seventy years of age, we fancy that we can detect in the style a foreshadowing of some of the qualities which rendered that of the man so remarkable. There is the same orderly arrangement of what he has to say, the same absence of rhetoric, the same logical deduction of the conclusion from the premisses. As we turn over the pages we are struck by the extent of reading which the allusions suggest. The best English authors, the most famous men of antiquity, are quoted as if the writer were familiar with them. The themes, too, are singularly varied. We find 'An Eastern Tale,' which, though redolent of *Rasselas*, is not devoid of originality and has considerable power of description; an 'Address' delivered to the Worshipful Company of Drapers at their annual visit to Bancroft's School, which is not more fulsome than such compositions usually are; and, lastly, half a dozen poems, which are by far the best things in the book. Let us take, almost at random, a few lines from the last: 'Characters often Seen, but little Marked: a Satire.' A young lady, called Clara, is anxious to break off a match, and lays her plot in the following fashion:—

but
surp
chil
piec
ness
the
of t
ing
thor
the
writ
the

pain
equa
which
it to
and
at di
a sha
effort
versa
of a
entre

I
Char
deter
of L
incon
whet
whet

1 J
2 J
care to
to be
of bo

'The marriage eve arrived : she chanced to meet
 The unsuspecting lover in the street ;
 Begins an artful, simple tale to tell.
 "I'm glad to see your future spouse so well,
 But I just heard—" "What?" cries the curious swain.
 "You may not like it ; I must not explain."
 "What was the dear, delusive creature at?"
 "Oh ! nothing, nothing, only private chat."
 "A pack of nonsense ! it cannot be true !
 "As if, dear girl, she could be false to you !"

Here, again, there may not be much originality of thought, but the versification is excellent, and the whole piece of surprising merit, when we reflect that it was written by a child. Yet, whatever may be the worth of this and other pieces in the volume before us as a promise of future greatness, we cannot but pity the poor little fellow, stimulated by the inconsiderate vanity of his parents to a priggish affectation of teaching others when he ought to have been either learning himself or at play with his schoolfellows ; and we can thoroughly sympathize with the Bishop's feelings respecting the book. The lady to whom the *Letters to a Friend* were written had evidently asked him for a copy, and obtained the following answer :—

'I am sure that if you knew the point in my foot which gives me pain you would not select that to kick or tread upon ; and I am equally sure that if you had been aware of the intense loathing with which I think of the subject of your note you would not have recalled it to my mind. When Mrs. P—, in the simplicity of her heart, and no doubt believing it to be an agreeable subject to me, told me at dinner on Thursday that she possessed the hated volume, it threw a shade over my enjoyment of the evening, and it was with a great effort that, after a pause, I could bring myself to resume the conversation. If I could buy up every copy for the flames, without risk of a reprint, I should hardly think any price too high. Let me entreat you never again to remind me of its existence.'¹

In 1809 young Thirlwall was sent as a day scholar to the Charterhouse, the choice of a school having very likely been determined by the fact that his father resided at the east end of London. The records of his school days are provokingly incomplete ; nay, almost a blank. We should like to know whether he was ever a boy in the ordinary sense of the word ; whether he ever played at games,² or got into mischief, or

¹ *Letters to a Friend*, p. 155.

² Dean Perowne mentions (Preface, p. viii.) that 'at school he did not care to enter into the games and amusements of the other boys, but was to be seen at play-hour withdrawing himself into some corner with a pile of books under his arm.'

obtained the distinction of a flogging. As far as his studies were concerned, he was fortunate in going to the Charterhouse when that excellent scholar Dr. Raine was head master, and in being the contemporary of several boys who afterwards distinguished themselves, among whom may be specially mentioned his life-long friend Julius Charles Hare, and George Grote, with whom, in after years, he was to be united by an identity of literary work. His chief friend, however, at this period was not one of his schoolfellows, but a young man named John Candler,¹ a Quaker, resident at Ipswich. Several of the letters addressed to him during the four years spent at Charterhouse have fortunately been preserved. When we remember that these were written between the ages of twelve and sixteen, they must be regarded as possessing extraordinary merit. They are studied and rather stilted compositions, evidently the result of much thought and labour, as was usual in days when postage cost eightpence; but they reveal a wonderfully wide extent of reading, and an interest in passing events not usual in so ardent a student as the writer evidently had even then become. Young Candler was 'a friend to liberty' and an admirer of Sir Francis Burdett. His correspondent criticizes the popular hero and the mob, who, 'after having broken the ministerial windows and pelted the soldiers with brickbats, have gone quietly home and left him to his meditations upon Tower Hill,' with much severity. Most thoughtful boys are fond of laying down the lines of their future life in their letters to their schoolfellows; but how few there are who do not change their opinions utterly, and end by adopting some profession wholly different from that which at first attracted them! This was not the case with Thirlwall. We find him writing at twelve years old in terms which he would not have disdained at fifty. 'I shall never be a bigot in politics,' he says; 'whither my reason does not guide me I will suffer myself to be led by the nose by no man.'² 'I would ask the advocates for confining learning to the breasts of the wealthy and the noble, in whose breasts are the seeds of sedition and discontent most easily sown? In that of the unenlightened or well-informed peasant? In that of a man incapable of

¹ Candler was seven years older than Thirlwall. He was junior assistant in a draper's shop at Ipswich, and afterwards set up in business on his own account at Chelmsford, where he became a leading member of the Society of Friends. He died, nearly eighty years of age, in 1872. We have not been able to ascertain how he became acquainted with Thirlwall.

² *Letters, &c.*, p. 7.

judging either of the disadvantages of his station or the means of ameliorating it? . . . These were long since my sentiments.¹ And, lastly, on the burning question of Parliamentary Reform: 'Party prejudice must own it rather contradictory to reason and common sense that a population of one hundred persons should have two representatives, while four hundred thousand are without one. These are abuses which require speedy correction.'² He had evidently been taken to see Cambridge, and was constantly looking forward to his residence there. His anticipations, however, were not wholly agreeable. At that time he did not care much for classics. He thought that they were not 'objects of such infinite importance that the most valuable portion of man's life, the time which he passes at school and at college, should be devoted to them.' In after-life he said that he had been 'injudiciously plied with Horace at the Charterhouse,' and that, in consequence, 'many years elapsed before I could enjoy the most charming of Latin poets.'³ He admits, however, that he is looking forward 'with hope and pleasing anticipation to the time when I shall immure myself' at Cambridge; and he makes some really admirable reflections, most unusual at that period, on University distinctions and the use to be made of them.

'There is one particular in which I hope to differ from many of those envied persons who have attained to the most distinguished academical honours. Several of these seem to have considered the years which they have spent at the University not as the time of preparation for studies of a severer nature, but as the term of their labours, the completion of which is the signal for a life of indolence, dishonourable to themselves and unprofitable to mankind. Literature and science are thus degraded from their proper rank as the most dignified occupations of a rational being, and are converted into instruments for procuring the gratification of our sensual appetites. This will not, I trust, be the conduct of your friend. Sorry indeed should I be to accept the highest honours of the University were I from that time destined to sink into an obscure and useless inactivity.'⁴

An English translation of the *Pensées de Pascal* had fallen in his way; and, in imitation of that great thinker, he had formed a resolution, of which he begs his friend to remind him in future years, to devote himself wholly to such studies (among others to the acquisition of a knowledge of Hebrew)

¹ *Letters*, &c., p. 17. ² *Ibid.* p. 8. ³ *Letters to a Friend*, p. 225.

⁴ *Letters*, &c., p. 21. The letter is dated December, 1813, when the writer was sixteen years old.

as would fit him for the clerical profession. We shall see that he never really faltered from these intentions ; for, though he was at one time beset with doubts as to his fitness to perform the practical duties of a clergyman, he was from first to last a theologian, and only admitted other studies as ancillary to that central object.

Thirlwall left Charterhouse in December 1813, and proceeded to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October of the following year. How he spent the interval has not been recorded—probably, like many other boys educated at a purely classical school, in doing his best to acquire an adequate knowledge of mathematics, to his deficiency in which there are frequent references. He was so far successful in his efforts that he obtained the place of 22nd senior optime in 1818, when he proceeded in due course to his degree. Meanwhile, however great his distaste for the classics might have been at school, he had risen to high distinction in them ; for he obtained the Craven University scholarship when only a freshman, as well as the Bell scholarship, and in the year of his degree the first Chancellor's medal.¹ In the autumn of the same year he was elected Fellow of his college. It is provoking to have to admit that our record of what may be termed the first part of his Cambridge career must begin and end here. Of the second portion, when he returned to his college and became assistant tutor, we shall have plenty to say hereafter ; but of his undergraduate days no record has been preserved. He had the good fortune to enter his college when the society there was exceptionally brilliant ; among his contemporaries were Sedgwick, Whewell, the two Waddingtons, his old friend Hare, who gained a Fellowship in the same year as himself, and many others who contributed to make that period of University history a golden age. We can imagine him in their company 'moulding high thought in colloquy serene,' and taking part in anything which might develop the general culture of the place ; but beyond the facts that he was secretary to the Union Society in 1817, when the 'debate was interrupted by the entrance of the proctors, who laid on its members the commands of the Vice-Chancellor to disperse ; and on no account to resume their dis-

¹ Professor Monk, who had examined Thirlwall on one of these occasions, was so much struck with the vigour and accuracy of his translations that he remarked to a friend, who had also had experience of his worth as a scholar, 'Had I been sitting in my library, with unlimited access to books, I could not have done better.' 'Nor so well,' was the reply.

cession
eloqu
him.
as ju
was,
prob
which
meta
The
spon
they
on hi
of Gr
Italia
and c
which

'I
of the
ness o
of un
peruse
langua
and th
may h
wants
most e
my in
fluctua
abaten

TI
was w
month
into h

¹ C
The w
entitled
Society
24, 181
ment'
The V
officers
Secreta
speech
stated
will pl
siderat

² A
³ L

cussions,'¹ and that he had acquired a high reputation for eloquence as a speaker there,² we know nothing definite about him. He does not appear to have made any new friends; but as Julius Hare was in residence during the same period as he was, the two doubtless saw much of each other; and it is probably to him that Thirlwall owed the love of Wordsworth which may be detected in some of his letters, his fondness for metaphysical speculation, and his wish to learn German. The only letters preserved are addressed to his old correspondent Mr. Candler, and to his uncle Mr. John Thirlwall, and they give us no information special to Cambridge. He dwells on his fondness for ancient history, on his preference for that of Greece over that of Rome; he records the addition of the Italian and German languages to his stock of acquirements; and describes with enthusiasm his yearning for foreign travel, which each year grew stronger.

'I certainly was not made to sit at home in contented ignorance of the wonders of art and nature, nor can I believe that the restlessness of curiosity I feel was implanted in my disposition to be a source of uneasiness rather than enjoyment. Under this conviction I peruse the authors of France and Italy, with the idea that the language I am now reading I may one day be compelled to speak, and that what is now a source of elegant and refined entertainment may be one day the medium through which I shall disclose my wants and obtain a supply of the necessities of life. This is the most enchanting of my day dreams; it has been for some years past my inseparable companion. And, apt as are my inclinations to fluctuate, I cannot recollect this to have ever undergone the slightest abatement.'³

The letter from which we have selected the above passage was written to his uncle in 1816; in another, written a few months later to his friend Mr. Candler, he enters more fully into his difficulties and prospects. The earlier portion of the

¹ Cooper's *Annals of the Town and University of Cambridge*, iv. 516. The words between inverted commas in our text are from a pamphlet entitled 'A Statement regarding the Union, an Academical Debating Society, which existed at Cambridge from February 13, 1815, to March 24, 1817, when it was suppressed by the Vice-Chancellor.' The 'statement' is evidently official, and is thoroughly business-like and temperate. The Vice-Chancellor was Dr. Wood, Master of S. John's College; the officers of the society were: Mr. Whewell, *President*; Mr. Thirlwall, *Secretary*; Mr. H. J. Rose, *Treasurer*. The late Professor Selwyn, in a speech at the opening of the new Union building, October 30, 1866, stated that on the entrance of the proctors the President said, 'Strangers will please to withdraw, and the House will take the message into consideration.'

² *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*, p. 125.

³ *Letters, &c.*, p. 31.

letter is well worth perusal for the insight it affords into the extent of his reading and the originality of his criticisms; but it is the concluding paragraph which is specially interesting to a biographer. We do not know to what influences the change was due, but it is evident that his mind was passing through a period of unrest; his old determinations had been, at least for the moment, uprooted, and he looked forward with uncertain eyes to an unknown future. 'My disinclination to the Church,' he says, 'has grown from a motive into a reason.' The Bar had evidently been suggested to him as the only alternative, and on that dismal prospect he dilates with unwonted bitterness. It would take him away from all the pursuits he loved most dearly, and put in their place 'the routine of a barren and uninteresting occupation,' in which not only would the best years of his life be wasted, but—and this is what he seems to have dreaded most—his loftier aspirations would be degraded, and when he had become rich enough to return to literature he would feel no inclination to do so.

The Fellowship examination in 1818 having ended in Thirlwall's election, he was free to go abroad, and at once started alone for Rome. At that time Niebuhr was Prussian Envoy there, and Bunsen his Secretary of Legation. Thirlwall was so fortunate as to bring with him a letter of introduction to Madame Bunsen, who had been a Miss Waddington, cousin to Professor Monk, and had married Bunsen about a year before Thirlwall's visit. The following amusing letter from Madame Bunsen to her mother gives an interesting picture of Thirlwall in Rome:—

'March 16, 1819.—Mr. Hinds and Mr. Thirlwall are here. . . . My mother has, I know, sometimes suspected that a man's abilities are to be judged of in an *inverse ratio* to his Cambridge honours; but I believe that rule is really not without exception, for Mr. Thirlwall is certainly no dunce, although, as I have been informed, he attained high honours at Cambridge at an earlier age than anybody except, I believe, Porson. In the course of their first interview Charles heard enough from him to induce him to believe that Mr. Thirlwall had studied Greek and Hebrew in good earnest, not merely for prizes; also that he had read Mr. Niebuhr's Roman History proved him to possess no trifling knowledge of German; and, as he expressed a wish to improve himself in the language, Charles ventured to invite him to come to us on a Tuesday evening whenever he was not otherwise engaged, seeing that many Germans were in the habit of calling on that day. Mr. Thirlwall has never missed any Tuesday evening since, except the *moccoli* night and one other when it rained dogs and cats. He comes at eight o'clock, and

never
often
more
—rea
speak
hims
music
at on
are a
Thirl
and
every
doubt
rather
was l
asked
he gr
my fa
as suc
worth
Thes
stress
own
Thirl
thoro
studie
taken
media
cedin
'A

self u
very
thoug
ing bu
being
that i
whose
conclu
in his
rather
but I
worse
societ

It
failed
inform

1. A
prefere

never stirs to go away till everybody else has wished good night, often at almost twelve o'clock. It is impossible for any one to behave more like a man of sense and a gentleman than he has always done—ready and eager to converse with anybody that is at leisure to speak to him, but never looking fidgety when by necessity left to himself; always seeming animated and attentive, whether listening to music, or trying to make out what people say in German, or looking at one of Goethe's songs in the book while it is sung. And so there are a great many reasons for our being *very much* pleased with Mr. Thirlwall; yet I rather suspect him of being very cold and very dry; and although he seeks, and seeks with general success, to understand everything, and in every possible way increase his stock of ideas, I doubt the possibility of his understanding anything that is to be *felt* rather than *explained*, and that cannot be reduced to a system. I was led to this result by some most extraordinary questions that he asked Charles about Faust (which he had borrowed of us, and which he greatly admired nevertheless, attempting a translation of one of my favourite passages, which, however, I had not pointed out to him as such), and also by his great fondness for the poems of Wordsworth, two volumes of which he insisted on lending to Charles. These books he accompanied with a note, in which he laid great stress upon the necessity of reading the author's *prose essays on his own poems*, in order to be enabled to relish the latter. Yet Mr. Thirlwall speaks of Dante in a manner that would seem to prove a thorough taste for his poetry, as well as that he has really and truly studied it; for he said to me that he thought no person who had taken the trouble to understand the whole of the *Divina Commedia* would doubt about preferring the "Paradiso" to the two preceding parts, an opinion in which I thoroughly agree.¹

'As Mr. Thirlwall can speak French sufficiently well to make himself understood, and as he has *something to say*, Charles found it very practicable to make him and Professor Bekker acquainted, though Professor Bekker has usually the great defect of *never* speaking but when he is prompted by his own inclination, and of never being *inclined to speak* except to persons whom he has long known—that is, to whose faces and manners he has become accustomed and whose understanding or character he respects or likes. . . . In conclusion, I must say about Mr. Thirlwall that I was prepossessed in his favour by his having made up in a marked manner to Charles rather than to myself. I had no difficulty in getting on with him, but I had all the advances to make; and I can never think the worse of a young man, just fresh from college and unused to the society of women, for not being at his ease with them at first.'

It is vexatious that Thirlwall's biographers should have failed to discover—if indeed they tried to discover—any information about his Roman visit, to which he always looked

¹ An old friend of Bishop Thirlwall informs us that he retained his preference for the 'Paradiso' in after years.

back with delight, occasioned as much by the friends he had made there as by 'the memorable scenes and objects' he had visited.¹ So far as we know, the above letter is the only authority extant. We should like to have heard whether Thirlwall had, or had not, any personal intercourse with Niebuhr, whom we have reason to believe he never met; and to what extent Bunsen influenced his future studies. We find it stated in Bunsen's life that he determined Thirlwall's wavering resolutions in favour of the clerical profession.² This, we shall see, is clearly a mistake; but, when we consider the strong theological bias of Bunsen's own mind, it does seem probable that he would direct his attention to the modern school of German divinity. We suspect that Thirlwall had been already influenced in this direction by the example, if not by the direct precepts, of Herbert Marsh, then Lady Margaret's Professor of Theology at Cambridge,³ who had stirred up a great controversy by translating Michaelis' *Introduction to the New Testament*, and by promoting a more free criticism of the Gospels than had hitherto been thought permissible. However this may be, it is certain that the friendship which began in Rome was one of the strongest and most abiding influences which shaped Thirlwall's character, and just half a century afterwards we find him referring to Bunsen as a sort of oracle in much the same language that Dr. Arnold was fond of employing.

We must pass lightly and rapidly over the next seven years of Thirlwall's life. He entered as a law student at Lincoln's Inn in February 1820, and in 1827 returned to Cambridge. In the intervening period he had given the law a fair trial; but the more he saw of it the less he liked it. It is painful to think of the weary hours spent over work of which he could say, four years after he had entered upon it, 'It can never be anything but loathsome to me;' ⁴ 'my aversion to the law has not increased, as it scarcely could, from the first day of my initiation into its mysteries;' or to read his pathetic utterances to Bunsen, describing his wretchedness, and the delight he took in his brief excursions out of law into literature, consoling himself with the reflection that perhaps he gained in intensity of enjoyment what he lost in duration. With these feelings it would have been useless for him to persevere; but we think it not improbable that

¹ Letter to Bunsen, November 21, 1831, *Letters*, &c., p. 99.

² *Memoirs of Baron Bunsen*, i. 339.

³ Marsh was professor from 1807 to 1839. The first volume of his translation of Michaelis had appeared in 1793.

⁴ *Letters*, &c., p. 55

much
due to
carried
his sub
was n
beginn
spent
could
reading
Schleier
which
take th
criticis
spent s
ingenu
opport
the ori
title pa
literatu
Marsh
first C
referen
theory
theolog
than t
between
Liberal
Th
he at c
work.²
accepti
urgent
the tut
Vacati
visits t
Histor
togeth

¹ A
Schleier
account
since Bi
² Be
Junior L
one of t
³ Se
third ed

much of his future eminence as a bishop might have been due to his legal training. As a friend has remarked, 'he carried the temper, and perhaps the habit, of Equity into all his subsequent work.' Even in these years, however, law was not allowed to engross his whole time. From the beginning he had laid this down as a fixed principle. He spent his vacations in foreign travel, and every moment he could snatch from law was devoted to a varied course of reading, of which the main outcome was a translation of Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke*,¹ to which his friend Hare had introduced him. To those who take the trouble of reading this almost forgotten piece of criticism it will appear strange that Thirlwall should have spent so much time over such a curious specimen of misplaced ingenuity. The explanation is to be found, we think, in the opportunity it afforded him for studying the whole question of the origin and authorship of the synoptic Gospels, and, as the title page informs us, for dealing with the contributions to the literature of the subject which had appeared since Bishop Marsh's *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our three first Canonical Gospels*, published in 1801. In this direct reference to Marsh's work we find a confirmation of our theory that Thirlwall owed to him his position as a critical theologian, though we can hardly imagine a greater difference than that which must have existed in all other matters between the passionate Toryism of the one and the serene Liberalism of the other.

Thirlwall's return to Cambridge took place in 1827, and he at once undertook his full share of college and University work.² His friend Hare had set the example in 1822 by accepting a classical lectureship at Trinity College at the urgent request of Mr. Whewell, then lately appointed to one of the tutorships,³ and Thirlwall had paid visits to him in the Long Vacations of 1824 and 1825. It is probable that at one of these visits the friends had planned their translation of Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, and that the convenience of working at it together determined the precise period of Thirlwall's return to

¹ *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke*. By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher. With an introduction by the Translator, containing an account of the controversy respecting the origin of the first three Gospels since Bishop Marsh's dissertation. 8vo. London: 1825.

² Between 1827 and 1832 he held the college offices of Junior Bursar, Junior Dean, and Head Lecturer. In 1828, 1829, 1832, and 1834 he was one of the examiners for the Classical Tripos.

³ See Dean Stanley's Memoir of Archdeacon Hare, prefixed to the third edition of *The Victory of Faith*. 1874.

the University. The first volume was far advanced in 1827, and published early in 1828. The second did not appear until 1832. The publication of what Thirlwall rightly terms 'a wonderful masterpiece of genius' in an English dress formed an epoch in historical and classical literature in this country. Yet, notwithstanding its pre-eminent excellence, the work of the translators was bitterly attacked in various places, but particularly in a note appended to an article in the *Quarterly Review*, a criticism which is now remembered only as having called forth a reply known in the University as 'Hare's bark and Thirlwall's bite.'¹ The pamphlet consists of sixty-three pages, of which sixty belong to the former, and a 'Postscript,' of little more than two, to the latter. It is probable that Hare's elaborate vindication of his author, his brother translator, and himself, had but little effect on any one; Thirlwall's indignant sarcasms—worthy of the best days of that controversial style in which he subsequently became a master—must have made the writer feel ashamed of himself. He had expressed pity that the translators should have wasted 'such talents on the drudgery of translation.' Thirlwall took exception to the phrase, and pointed out that their intellectual labour did not deserve to be so spoken of.

'On the other hand, intellectual labour prompted and directed by no higher consideration than that of personal emolument appears to me to deserve an ignominious name; nor do I think such an employment the less illiberal, however great may be the abilities exerted, or the advantages purchased. But I conceive such labour to become still more degrading, when it is let out to serve the views and advocate the opinions of others. It sinks another step lower in my estimation, when, instead of being applied to communicate what is excellent and useful, it ministers to the purpose of excluding from circulation all such intellectual productions as have not been stamped with the seal of the party to which it is itself subservient. But when I see it made the instrument of a religious, political, or literary proscription, forging or pointing calumny and slander, to gratify the malice of hotter and weaker heads against all whom they hate and fear, I have now before me an instance of what I consider as the lowest and basest intellectual drudgery. I leave the application of these distinctions to the QUARTERLY REVIEWER.'

In 1831 the two friends started the publication of the

¹ *A Vindication of Niebuhr's 'History of Rome' from the Charges of the 'Quarterly Review.'* By Julius Charles Hare, M.A. Cambridge, 1829. The passage commented on will be found in the *Quarterly Review* for January 1829 (vol. xxxix. p. 8). The first edition of Niebuhr's own work had been highly praised in an article in the same *Review* for June 1825 (vol. xxxii. p. 67).

Philological Museum. It had a brief but glorious career. Only six numbers were published, but they contained 'more solid additions to English literature and scholarship' than had up to that time appeared in any other journal. We are glad to see that Dean Perowne has republished seven of Thirlwall's contributions, among which is the well-known essay *On the Irony of Sophocles*. In 1832, when Mr. Hare left Cambridge, his friend succeeded him as assistant-tutor, to give classical lectures to the undergraduates on Whewell's 'side.' For a time all went well. His lectures were exceedingly popular with those capable of appreciating them, as was shown by the large attendance not only of undergraduates, but of the best scholars in the college, men who had already taken their degrees, and who were working for the Fellowship Examination or for private improvement. They were remarkable for translations of singular excellence, and for an exhaustive treatment of the subject, as systematic as Hare's had been desultory, as we learn from traditions of them which still survive, and from two volumes of notes which now lie before us, taken down at a course on the *Ethics* of Aristotle. Moreover Thirlwall was personally popular. He was the least 'donnish' of the resident Fellows, and sought the society of undergraduates, inviting the men who attended his lectures to walk with him or to take wine at his rooms after Hall. He delighted in a good story, and used to throw himself back in his chair, his whole frame shaking with suppressed merriment, when anything especially humorous struck his fancy. He had one habit which, had it been practised with less delicacy, might have marred his popularity. He was fond of securing an eager but inconsiderate talker, whom he drew out, by a series of subtle questions, for the amusement of the rest. So well known was this peculiarity among his older friends that after one of his parties a person who had not been present has been heard to inquire from another who had just left his rooms, 'Who was fool to-day?'

In 1834 Thirlwall's connection with the educational staff of the college was rudely severed by the celebrated controversy respecting the admission of Dissenters to degrees. This debate has been long since forgotten in the University; but the influence which it exercised on Thirlwall's future career, as well as its own intrinsic interest, point it out for particular notice. We had occasion in a recent article¹ to sketch the

¹ 'Half a Century of Cambridge Life,' *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1882.

changes which took place in the University between 1815 and 1830. It will be remembered that the stormy period of our political history which is associated with the first Reform Bill fell between those dates. It was hardly to be expected that Cambridge should escape an influence by which the country was so profoundly affected. Indeed, it may be cited as a sign of the absorbing interest of that question, that it did affect the University so seriously; for there is ample evidence that in the previous century external events, no matter how important, had made but little impression. In 1746 we find the poet Gray lamenting that his fellow academicians were so indifferent to the march of the Pretender; and even the French Revolution excited but a languid enthusiasm, though Dr. Milner, the Vice-Chancellor, and his brother Heads, did their best to draw attention to it by expelling from the University Mr. Frend, of Jesus College, for writing a pamphlet called *Peace and Union*, which advocated the principles of its leaders. With the Reform Bill of 1830, however, the case was very different. Sides were eagerly taken; discussions grew hot and angry; old friends became estranged; and, years afterwards, when children of the next generation asked questions of their parents about some one whose name was mentioned in their hearing, but with whom they were not personally acquainted, the common answer they received was: 'That is Mr. So-and-so; he used to be very intimate with us before the Reform Bill; but we never speak now.'

Among other matters then debated was the exclusion of Dissenters from participation in the advantages of the Universities. The propriety of imposing tests at matriculation, and on proceeding to degrees, especially to degrees in the faculties of law and physic, had been from time to time debated, both in the University and in the House of Commons. The ancient practice had, notwithstanding, been steadily maintained. On one occasion, in 1773, the House had even gone so far as to decline, by a majority of 146, to receive a petition on the subject. In December 1833, however, Professor Pryme offered Graces to the Senate for appointing a Syndicate to consider the abolition or the modification of subscription on graduation. The 'Caput' rejected them. In February of the following year, Dr. Cornwallis Hewett, Downing Professor of Medicine, offered similar Graces to consider the subject with special reference to the faculty of medicine. This also was rejected by the 'Caput.' These two rejections, following so closely upon each other,

mad
dispe
deter
once
Prof
was
Parli
of th
Univ
'that
the v
some
or th
the v
"Th
exist
comm
Chris
of ab
from
wheth

This
Senat
Davy
Profe
Airy,
serva
Hous
by M
As m
about
was
signed
a num
had th
pressi
memb
the p
oppos
the H
subject

1 T
21, 18
presen

made it evident that the authorities of the University were not disposed so much as to consider the subject. It was therefore determined to extend the field of the controversy, and at once to apply to the Legislature. A meeting was held at Professor Hewett's rooms in Downing College, at which it was agreed to present an identical petition to both Houses of Parliament. The document began by stating the attachment of the petitioners to the Church of England, and to the University as connected therewith; and further, their belief 'that no civil or ecclesiastical polity was ever so devised by the wisdom of man as not to require, from time to time, some modification from the change of external circumstances or the progress of opinion.' They then suggested—this was the word employed—

"That no corporate body, like the University of Cambridge, can exist in a free country in honour and safety unless its benefits be communicated to all classes as widely as may be compatible with the Christian principles of its foundation;" and urged "the expediency of abrogating by legislative enactment every religious test exacted from members of the University before they proceed to degrees, whether of Bachelor, Master, or Doctor, in Arts, Law, or Physic."

This petition was signed by sixty-two resident members of the Senate. Among them were two Masters of Colleges, Dr. Davy, of Caius, and Dr. Lamb, of Corpus Christi; and nine Professors, Hewett, Lee, Cumming, Clark, Babbage, Sedgwick, Airy, Musgrave, Henslow; some of whom were either Conservatives, or very moderate Liberals. It was presented to the House of Lords by Earl Grey, and to the House of Commons by Mr. Spring-Rice, member for the town of Cambridge. As might have been expected, it was met, after an interval of about ten days, by a protest, signed by 110 residents; which was shortly followed by a counter-petition to Parliament, signed by 258 members of the Senate, mostly non-residents—a number which would no doubt have been greatly enlarged had there been more time for collecting signatures.¹ These expressions of opinion, however, which showed that even resident members of the University were not unanimous in desiring the proposed relief, while non-residents were probably strongly opposed to it, did not prevent the introduction of a Bill into the House of Commons to make it 'lawful for all his Majesty's subjects to enter and matriculate in the Universities of

¹ The first petition was presented to the House of Lords on March 21, 1834; the protest is dated April 3; and the counter-petition was presented on April 21 in the same year.

England, and to receive and enjoy all degrees in learning conferred therein (degrees in Divinity alone excepted), without being required to subscribe any articles of religion, or to make any declaration of religious opinions respecting particular modes of faith and worship.' The third reading of this Bill was carried by a majority of 89; but it was rejected in the House of Lords by a majority of 102.

It will easily be imagined that these proceedings were watched with the greatest interest at Cambridge. Public opinion had risen to fever-heat, and a plentiful crop of pamphlets was the result. It is difficult nowadays to read without a smile these somewhat hysterical productions, and to note the non-fulfilment of their prophecies of untold evils to come, should the fatal measure suggested by the petitioners ever pass into the Statute-book. Among these, that which most concerns our present purpose is one by Dr. Thomas Turton, then Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Lord Bishop of Ely, entitled, *Thoughts on the Admission of Persons, without regard to their Religious Opinions, to certain Degrees in the Universities of England*. Dr. Turton was universally respected, and his pamphlet attracted great attention on that account, and also from the ability and ingenuity of the argument. He adopted the comparative method; and endeavoured to prove the evils that would ensue from the intercourse of young men who differed widely from one another in theological beliefs, by tracing the history of the Theological Seminary for Nonconformists, commenced by the celebrated Dr. Doddridge, in 1729, at Northampton, and subsequently removed to Daventry in 1751. The gauntlet thus thrown down was taken up by Mr. Thirlwall, who lost but little time in addressing to him a *Letter on the Admission of Dissenters to Academical Degrees*. After stating briefly that what he was about to say would be said on his own responsibility, and that he did not come forward as 'the organ or advocate' of those who had taken the same side as himself, many of whom, he thought, would not agree with him, he proceeded to attack the analogy between Cambridge and Daventry which Dr. Turton had attempted to establish. 'Our colleges,' he boldly asserted, 'are not theological seminaries. We have no theological colleges, no theological tutors, no theological students.' The statement was literally true; it might even be said to be as capable of demonstration as the first proposition of the first book of Euclid's *Elements of Geometry*; but uttered in that way, in a controversial pamphlet, in support of a most unpopular cause, it must have sounded like

the
Dr.
lege
of c
whic
Thir
thou
for
in th
mos
Uni
servi
whet
to r
imp
men
exer
we
enun
comp
a hea
evil.

alto
as far
of our
few re
conce

H
was c

'But i
as it n
honou
rise or
which
one as
would

'A
be ans
know
essenti
what k
body, c
I am v
end mi
that it

VOL

the blast of a hostile trumpet. This, however, was not all. Dr. Turton had claimed for the Universities the same privilege which was enjoyed by Nonconformists, viz. the possession of colleges where 'those principles of religion alone are taught which are in agreement with their own peculiar views.' Mr. Thirlwall, therefore, proceeded to inquire whether the colleges, though not theological seminaries, might be held to be schools for religious instruction. This question again he answered in the negative; and his opponent having placed in the foremost rank among the privileges long exercised by the Universities (1) the relation of tutor to pupil, (2) the chapel services, (3) the college lectures, he proceeded to examine whether these could 'properly be numbered among the aids to religion which this place furnishes.' To him it appeared impossible, under any circumstances, to instil religion into men's minds against their will. 'We cannot even prescribe exercises, or propose rewards for it, without killing the thing we mean to foster.' The value of the three aids above enumerated had been, he thought, greatly exaggerated; and compulsory attendance at chapel—'the constant repetition of a heartless, mechanical service'—he denounced as a positive evil.

'My reason for thinking that our daily services might be omitted altogether, without any material detriment to religion, is simply that, as far as my means of observation extend, with an immense majority of our congregation it is not a religious service at all, and that to the few remaining it is the least impressive and edifying that can well be conceived.'

He had no fault to find with the way in which the service was conducted; the outward decorum was nearly perfect.

'But if this decorum were to be carried to the highest perfection, as it might easily be, if it should ever become a mode and a point of honour with the young men themselves, the thing itself would not rise one step in my estimation. I should still think, that the best which could be said of it would be, that at the end it leaves every one as it found him, and that the utmost religion could hope from it would be to suffer no incurable wounds.

'As to any other purposes, foreign to those of religion, which may be answered by these services, I have here no concern with them. I know that it is sometimes said that the attendance at chapel is essential to discipline; but I have never been able to understand what kind of discipline is meant: whether it is a discipline of the body, or of the mind, or of the heart and affections. As to the first, I am very sensible of the advantage of early rising; but I think this end might be obtained by a much less circuitous process, and I suppose that it will hardly be reckoned among the uses of our evening service,

that it sometimes proves a seasonable interruption to intemperate gaiety ; but I confess that the word discipline, applied to this subject, conveys to my mind no notions which I would not wish to banish : it reminds me either of a military parade, or of the age when we were taught to be *good* at church.'

As a remedy for the existing state of things he suggested a weekly service, 'which should remind the young men of that to which they have, most of them, been accustomed at home.' Such a service as this, he thought, 'would afford the best opportunity of affording instruction of a really religious kind, which should apply itself to their situation and prospects, and address itself to their feelings.'

Next he took the college lectures in divinity, and proceeded to show, that, for the most part, they had no claim to be called theological. This part of his pamphlet excited even greater dissatisfaction than the other ; and it must be admitted that it was by far the weakest part of his case. His statements were presently examined, and completely refuted, by Mr. Robert Wilson Evans, then a resident Fellow of Trinity, who published a detailed account of the lectures on the New Testament which he had given during the past year in his own college.

Up to this time Mr. Whewell had taken no part in the controversy, because he had felt himself unable 'fully to agree with either of the contending parties.' But his position as tutor of the college whence the denunciation of the existing system had emanated—for the system of Trinity College was practically the system of all the other colleges in the University also—compelled him, though evidently with the greatest reluctance, to break silence. He argued that Thirlwall's opinion, that we cannot prescribe exercises or propose rewards for religion without killing that which we fain would foster, strikes at the root of all connexion between religion and civil institutions, such as an Established Church and the like ; that external influences have always been recognized by Christian communities, and must have been used even in the case of those services at home which his opponent approved. Chapel service is nothing more than family prayers. If, therefore, we teach our students that compulsion is destructive of all religion, shall we not make them doubt the validity of the religion which was instilled into their minds at home ? The aim of such ordinances and safeguards is to throw a religious character over all the business of life ; to bind religious thought upon us by the strongest of all constraints—the constraint of habit. He admitted that all was not perfect

in the
task-
devo
befor
amon
as it
the v
subse
ber r
servic
his M
intro
Sund
which
specia

T
days
wrote
assista

'I
of assi
years a
very i
prospe
in part

In
'W
tion, a
appears
stitution
underst
to him
on prin

Th
seated
they su
contem
comm
ence fr
least s
been in
import
that th
though

in the chapel services as they existed ; and lamented that the task of those who wished to make the undergraduates more devout would henceforward be harder than it had ever been before, through their consciousness of a want of unanimity among their instructors. A stated method is of use in religion as it is in other studies. What would become of men under the voluntary system ? It is interesting to remark that in a subsequent pamphlet written a few months later—in September 1834—he spoke in favour of such a change in the Sunday service as Mr. Thirlwall had suggested. Towards the close of his Mastership this change was effected, and a sermon was introduced at the second of the two morning services on Sundays. We are not aware, however, that the movement which resulted in this alteration was regarded with any special favour by the Master.

Thirlwall's pamphlet is dated May 21 ; Whewell's four days later. On the 26th the Master, Dr. Wordsworth, wrote to Mr. Thirlwall, calling upon him to resign the assistant-tutorship. The words used were :—

'I trust you will find no difficulty in resigning the appointment of assistant-tutor which I confided to you somewhat more than two years ago. Your continuing to retain it would, I am convinced, be very injurious to the good government, the reputation, and the prosperity of the college in general, to the interests of Mr. Whewell in particular, and to the welfare of the young men, and of many others.'

In another passage he went further still.

'With respect to the letter itself, I have read it with some attention, and, I am sorry to say, with extreme pain and regret. It appears to me of a character so out of harmony with the whole constitution and system of the college that I find some difficulty in understanding how a person with such sentiments can reconcile it to himself to continue a member of a society founded and conducted on principles from which he differs so widely.'

The Heads of Houses of that day regarded themselves as seated upon an academic Olympus, from whose serene heights they surveyed the common herd beneath them with a sort of contemptuous pity ; and they not only exacted, but were commonly successful in obtaining, the most precise obedience from their subjects. In Trinity College, however, at least since the days of Dr. Bentley, the Master had usually been in the habit of consulting the Seniors before taking any important step ; on this occasion, however, it is quite clear that the Seniors were not consulted. The Master probably thought that as he appointed the assistant-tutors he could also

remove them. We believe, however, that even in those days the Master usually consulted the tutors before appointing their subordinates; and common courtesy would have suggested a similar course of action before dismissing a distinguished scholar. It is said that the Master was advised to take the course he did by Mr. Hugh James Rose, who was in the University at the time, and on Whitsunday, May 18, had preached a sermon at Great S. Mary's on the 'Duty of Maintaining the Truth,' from S. Matt. x. 27: 'What ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops.' Thirlwall's letter, however, was not published before May 21, so that, unless the nature of it had been known beforehand, it is clear that anything which Mr. Rose had said in his sermon could not have referred to it. That Thirlwall believed that there was some connexion between the sermon, or at any rate the preacher, and his dismissal, is evident from the fact that when he showed the Master's letter to one of the junior Fellows, who expressed indignant surprise that such a course could have been taken, he remarked: 'Ah! let this be a warning to you to preach truth, if need be, upon the house-tops, but never under any circumstances to preach error.'¹

Thirlwall lost no time in obeying the Master's commands, and then issued a circular to the Fellows of the college, enclosing a copy of the Master's letter, in order that they might learn what was 'the power claimed by the Master over the persons engaged in the public instruction of the college, and the manner in which it has been exercised;' and secondly, that he might learn from them how far they agreed with the Master as to the propriety of his continuing a member of the Society. On this point he entreated each of them to favour him with a 'private, explicit, and unreserved declaration' of his opinions. It is needless to say that one and all desired to retain him among them; and the Master's conduct was condemned by a large majority. It must not, however, be supposed that Thirlwall's own conduct was held to be free from fault. He was much blamed for having resigned so hastily, without consulting any one, as it would appear, except Whewell and Perry. Moreover, many of the Fellows, among whom was Mr. Hare, condemned the Master's action, and censured Thirlwall's rashness in publishing such sentiments while holding a responsible office, with almost equal severity. This feeling explains, as we imagine, the very slight resistance

¹ Thirlwall was a regular attendant at Great S. Mary's, and no doubt heard the sermon in question.

made
hav
had p
the m
Thirl
he sh
'exp
could

In
nearl
Thirl
into a
ment
at an
in a p
of th
begun
been
sider
he ha
such
atten
more
and h
With
it wa
to de
rigor
exasp
out b
Talki
when
the fr
their
syste
must
preve
was a
profo
eyes
point
even t

It
Camb
pried

made to an act which, under any other circumstances, would have caused an explosion. The Fellows felt that the victim had put himself in the wrong ; and that, much as they regretted the necessity of submission, it was the only course to be taken. Thirlwall mentions in a letter to Professor Pryme that when he showed the Master's communication to Whewell, the latter 'expressed great regret,' but 'did not intimate that there could be any doubt as to our connexion being at an end.'

In reviewing the whole controversy at a distance of nearly half a century, with, we must admit, a strong bias in Thirlwall's favour, it is impossible not to admit that he fell into a very grave error. In all questions of college management it is most important that the authorities should appear, at any rate, to be unanimous ; and there are some expressions in a private letter which he addressed to Whewell at the close of the controversy which indicate that by that time he had begun to take the same view. It is easy to see how he had been drawn into an opposite course. He had never considered that he had anything to do with the chapel discipline ; he had agreed to attend himself, but he did not consider that such attendance implied approval of the system. His own attendance, as we learn from a contemporary, was something more than formal ; he was rarely absent, morning or evening ; and his behaviour was remarkable for reverence and devotion. With him, religion had nothing to do with discipline ; and it was infinitely shocking to his pure and thoughtful mind to defile things heavenly with things earthly. The far too rigorous rules of attendance which were then in force had exasperated the undergraduates, and their behaviour, without being absolutely profane, was careless and irreverent. Talking was very prevalent, especially on surplice nights, when the music is choral. Thirlwall probably knew, from the friendly intercourse which he maintained with them, what their feelings were, and determined to do his best to get a system altered which produced such disastrous results. It must be remembered that at that time the Act of Uniformity prevented any shortening of the service. Whewell's mind was a very different one. Without being a bigot, he had a profound respect for the existing order of things ; shut his eyes to any defects it might have, even when they were pointed out to him ; and regarded attempts to subvert it, or even to weaken it, as acts of profanity.

It will be readily conceived that these events rendered Cambridge no pleasant place of residence for Thirlwall, deprived of his occupation as a teacher and unsupported by

any particularly strong force of liberal opinion in the University. Yet he had the courage to make the experiment of continuing to live in college. He went abroad for the Long Vacation of 1834, and returned at the beginning of the October term. In a few weeks, however, the course of his life was changed by an unexpected event. Lord Melbourne's first Ministry broke up, and just as Lord Chancellor Brougham was regretting that Sedgwick and Thirlwall were the only clergymen who had deserved well of the Liberal party for whom he had been unable to provide, came the news of the death of one of the canons of Norwich and of the suicide of the Rector of Kirby Underdale, a valuable but very secluded living in Yorkshire. He at once offered the canonry to Sedgwick and the rectory to Thirlwall. Both offers were accepted, we believe, without hesitation; and both appointments, though evidently made without regard to the special fitness of the persons selected, were thoroughly successful. Sedgwick threw himself into the duties of a cathedral dignitary with characteristic vigour; and Thirlwall, whose only experience of parochial work had been at Over, in Cambridgeshire, a small village without a parsonage, of which he was vicar for a few months in 1829, became a zealous and popular parish priest. His biographer records that 'the recollection still survives of regular services with full and attentive congregations, including incomers from neighbouring villages; of the frequent visits to the village school; of the extempore prayers with his flock, of which the larger number were Dissenters; of the assiduous attentions to the sick and poor.' And his old friend, Archdeacon Hare, writing to Dr. Whewell in 1840, describes his work in his parish as 'perfect,' and holds up his example as 'an encouragement' to his correspondent to go and do likewise.¹

Thirlwall did not revisit Cambridge until 1842, when he stayed in Trinity College for two days during the installation of the Duke of Northumberland as Chancellor. Such an occasion, however, does not give much opportunity for judging of the real state of the University. He paid a similar visit in 1847, when Prince Albert was installed. After this he did not see Cambridge again until the spring of 1869, when he stayed at Trinity Lodge with the present Master, Dr. Thompson, and on Whitsunday, May 16, preached before the University in Great S. Mary's Church. He has himself recorded that he was never so much pleased with the place

¹ *Life of Dr. Whewell*, by Mrs. Stair Douglas, p. 211.

since he went up as a freshman, and has given an amusing description of a leisurely stroll round the backs of the colleges and through part of the town,¹ which, he might have added, he insisted upon taking without a companion. Those who conversed with him on that occasion remember that he was much struck by the changes which had taken place in the University since he had left it; and that he observed with pleasure the increased numbers of the undergraduates, and the movement and activity which seemed to reign everywhere.

It was at Kirby Underdale that Thirlwall wrote the greater part of the work on which his reputation as a scholar and a man of letters will chiefly rest—his *History of Greece*—of which the first volume had been published before he left Cambridge.² It is, perhaps, fortunate for the world that he had bound himself to produce the volumes at regular intervals,³ and that his editor, Dr. Dionysius Lardner (whom he used to call 'Dionysius the Tyrant'), was not a man to grant delays; for, had the conditions been easier, parochial cares and new interests might have retarded the production of it indefinitely, or even stopped it altogether. From the first Thirlwall had applied himself to the work with strenuous and unremitting energy. At Cambridge he used to work all day until half-past three o'clock in the afternoon, when he might be seen leaving his rooms for a half-hour's rapid walk before dinner, which then was served in Hall at four o'clock; and in the country he is said to have spent sixteen hours of the twenty-four in his study. We do not know what the original design of the work, as part of the *Cabinet Cyclopædia*, was, but we have it on Thirlwall's own authority that it was 'much narrower than that which it actually reached,'⁴ and before long it was further expanded into eight goodly octavos. The first of these was scarcely in the hands of the public when Grote's *History of Greece*, published, like its predecessor, volume by volume, began to make its appearance. It was mentioned above that Grote and Thirlwall had been school-fellows; but, though they met not unfrequently in London afterwards, Thirlwall knew so little of his friend's intentions that he had been heard to say, 'Grote is the man who ought

¹ *Letters to a Friend*, p. 191.

² The preface to the first edition of vol. i. is dated 'Trinity College, June 12, 1835.' The dates of the subsequent volumes are ii. iii., 1836; iv., 1837; v., 1838; vi., 1839; vii., 1840; viii., 1844.

³ *Letters*, &c. p. 138.

⁴ Preface to the second edition, dated 'London, May 1845.'

to write the History of Greece.' When it did appear he at once welcomed it with enthusiasm. 'High as my expectations were of it,' he writes to Dr. Schmitz, 'it has very much surpassed them all, and affords an earnest of something which has never been done for the subject either in our own or any other literature;' ¹ and to Grote himself, when the publication of four volumes had enabled him to form a maturer judgment, he not only used stronger words of praise, but contrasted it with his own History in terms which for generosity and sincerity can never be surpassed. After alluding to 'the great inferiority' of his 'own performance' he concludes as follows: 'I may well be satisfied with that measure of temporary success and usefulness which has attended it, and can unfeignedly rejoice that it will, for all highest purposes, be so superseded.'² It would be beside our present purpose to attempt a comparison of the relative merits of these two works, which, by a curious coincidence, had been elaborated simultaneously. They have many points of resemblance. Both originated in a desire to apply to the history of Greece those principles of criticism which Niebuhr had applied so successfully to the history of Rome; both were intended to counteract the misrepresentations of Mitford; both were the result of long and careful preparation. Grote has a decided advantage in point of style; he writes vigorous, 'newspaper' English, as might be expected from a successful pamphleteer; while Thirlwall's periods are laboured and somewhat wooden. But, notwithstanding Thirlwall's own feeling of Grote's superiority, and the precedence which his History has unquestionably taken up to the present time, we think it not improbable that posterity may reverse the verdict. Grote is always a partisan. We do not mean that he wilfully misrepresents facts; he certainly does not; but he unconsciously finds 'extenuating circumstances' for those with whom he sympathizes, and condemns remorselessly those whose springs of action are alien to his own. We need only remind our readers of his treatment of Kleon and Nikias. Again, his busy life left him no leisure for acquiring exact scholarship; and many of his conclusions have been overthrown by critics who, inferior to him in power, possessed the indispensable knowledge of minute points of language in which he was deficient.³ Thirlwall, on the contrary, holds the judicial balance with a firm hand. In estimating character

¹ *Letters*, &c. p. 194. The letter is dated April 9, 1846.

² *The Personal Life of George Grote*. By Mrs. Grote, p. 173.

³ *Thucydides or Grote?* By Richard Shilleto, M.A. 1851.

his s
wish
scho
will
prop
have
A
Thir
Lord
the
bour
judg
thou
Schl
appe
in th
the a
the b
doxy
Thirl
Melb
offere
first
go to
bour
follow
time
He is
paper
alloc
'
to say
if I k
bishop
they h
tinued
those
'They
we m
mach
cand
margin
opini
Had

his serene intellect is never warped by partisanship, or by a wish to present old facts under a new face; while from his scholarship and critical power there is no appeal. The public will probably continue to read Grote; but we venture to prophesy that students will return to Thirlwall, even if they have not already done so.

After a residence of five years at Kirby Underdale Thirlwall was unexpectedly made Bishop of S. David's by Lord Melbourne. Lord Houghton, an intimate friend of both the Bishop and the Minister, has recorded that Lord Melbourne was in the habit not merely of reading, but of severely judging and criticising the writings of every divine whom he thought of promoting. By some accident the translation of Schleiermacher's essay had fallen in his way soon after it appeared; he had formed a high opinion of Thirlwall's share in the work, and so far back as 1837 had done his best to send the author to Norwich instead of Dr. Stanley. On this occasion the bishops whom the Minister consulted regarded the orthodoxy of the views sustained in the essay as questionable, and Thirlwall's promotion was deferred. In 1840, however, Lord Melbourne got his way, and the bishopric of S. David's was offered in due form to the Rector of Kirby Underdale. His first impulse was to refuse; but his friends persuaded him to go to London, and at least have an interview with Lord Melbourne. We do not vouch for the literal accuracy of the following scene, but it is too amusing not to be related. The time is the forenoon; the place, Lord Melbourne's bedroom. He is supposed to be in bed, surrounded by letters and newspapers. On Thirlwall's entrance he delivers the following allocution:—

'Very glad to see you; sit down, sit down. Hope you are come to say you accept? I only wish you to understand that I don't intend, if I know it, to make a heterodox bishop. I don't like heterodox bishops. As men they may be very good anywhere else, but I think they have no business on the bench. I take great interest,' he continued, 'in theological questions, and I have read a good deal of those old fellows,' pointing to a pile of folio editions of the Fathers. 'They are excellent reading, and very amusing. Some time or other we must have a talk about them. I sent your edition of Schleiermacher to Lambeth, and asked the Primate (Howley) to tell me candidly what he thought of it; and look, here are his notes in the margin. Pretty copious, you see. He does not concur in all your opinions, but he says there is nothing heterodox in your book. Had he objected I would not have appointed you.'¹

¹ *Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne*. By W. M. Torrens, M.P. Vol. ii. p. 332. Lord Houghton in the *Fortnightly Review*, February 1878.

We should like to know how Thirlwall answered this strange defender of the faith ; but tradition is silent on the point. Before leaving, however, the offer was accepted ; and, with as little delay as possible, the Bishop removed to his diocese and entered upon his duties.

Thirlwall's life as a bishop did not differ much, at least in its outward surroundings, from his life as a parish clergyman. The palace at S. David's having been allowed to fall to ruin, the Bishop is compelled to live at Abergwili, a small village near Carmarthen, distant nearly fifty miles from his cathedral. Most persons would have regretted the isolation of such a position, but to Thirlwall the enforced solitude of Abergwili was thoroughly congenial. There he could read, as he delighted to do, 'literally from morning till night.' Except in summer time he rarely quitted 'Chaos,' as he called his library, where books lined the walls and shared with papers and letters the tables, chairs, and floor. It is curious that a man with so orderly a mind should have had such disorderly habits. His letters are full of references to lost papers ; and when offers to arrange his drawers were made he would answer regretfully, 'I can find nothing in them now, but if they were set to rights for me I should certainly find nothing then.' Books accompanied him to his meals ; and when he went out for a walk or a drive he read steadily most of the time. He does not seem to have had any favourite authors ; he read eagerly new books in all languages and on all subjects. We believe that he took no notes of what he read ; but his singularly powerful memory enabled him to seize all that he wanted, and, as may be seen from the collection of his writings which is now before us, to retain it until required for use. His charges, essays, and serious correspondence reveal his mastery of theological literature, both past and present ; the strong mental grasp with which he applied the lessons of the past to the edification of the present ; the wise tolerance for views which were not his own—a tolerance which yet had limits which sometimes, as we shall see, excited no little surprise—and, we may add, the terrible strength of his satire. The charming *Letters to a Friend* give us very pleasant glimpses of the gentler side of his character. We find from them that he took a keen interest in the general literature of England and the Continent, whether in philosophy, history, biography, fiction, poetry ; and as he and his young correspondent exchanged their sentiments without restraint, we can enjoy to the full his criticisms, now serious, now playful, on authors and their productions,

his
W
stor

not
one
sible
Mid
mus
hum
ther

gwi
sour
mig
trou
coul
bust
of co
his
flow
inter
with
told
para
after
shou
gwili
phea
fed e
treat
coat-
had t
day l
The
tions
him o
letter
June
in th
watch
down
It

his generous appreciation of all that is noble in life or art. We must find room for one passage on George Eliot's last story, written in 1872, when he was seventy-five years old.

'I suppose you cannot have read *Middlemarch*, as you say nothing about it. It stands quite alone. As one only just moistens one's lips with an exquisite liqueur to keep the taste as long as possible in one's mouth, I never read more than a single chapter of *Middlemarch* in the evening, dreading to come to the last, when I must wait two months for a renewal of the pleasure. The depth of humour has certainly never been surpassed in English literature. If there is ever a shade too much learning that is Lewis's fault.'¹

But there was another reason for his enjoyment of Aber-gwili. Student as he was, he delighted in the sights, the sounds, the air of the country. He never left it for his annual migration to London without regret, partly because it was so troublesome to move the mass of books without which he could not bear to leave home, but still more because the bustle and dust of London annoyed him; and in the midst of congenial society, and the enjoyment of music and pictures, his thoughts reverted with longing regret to his trees, his flowers, and his domestic pets. Even his books did not interest him as they did. He had begun his social relations with dogs and cats in Yorkshire, and an amusing story is told of the way in which the former disconcerted certain preparations for a formal reception of him when he came home after accepting the bishopric of S. David's, by jumping on his shoulders and excluding all human attentions.² At Aber-gwili he extended his affections to birds, and kept peacocks, pheasants, canaries, swans, and tame geese, which he regularly fed every morning, no matter what the weather might be. They treated him with easy familiarity, for they used to seize his coat-tails with their beaks to show their welcome. His flowers had to yield to the tastes of his four-footed friends. One day his gardener complained, 'What am I to do, my Lord? The hares have eaten your carnations.' 'Plant more carnations,' was his only reply. Fine summer weather would draw him out of 'Chaos' into the field or garden; and one of his letters gives a delicious picture of his enjoyment of a certain June, sitting on the grass while the haymakers were at work in the field beyond, reading *The Earthly Paradise*, and watching the movements of 'a dear horse' who paced up and down with a rake to turn and toss the hay.³

It must not, however, be supposed that Bishop Thirlwall

¹ *Letters to a Friend*, p. 278.

² *Ibid.* p. 161.

³ *Ibid.* p. 292.

lived the life of an indolent man of letters. No bishop ever performed the duties of his position more thoroughly, or with greater sacrifice of personal care and comfort. His first care was to learn Welsh, and in a little more than a year he could read prayers and preach in that language. In his large and little-known diocese locomotion was not easy and accommodation often hard to obtain. Yet he visited every part of it, personally inspected the condition of the schools and churches (deplorable enough in 1840), and regularly performed the duties of confirmation, preaching, and visitation. In the charge of 1866 he reviewed the improvements which had been accomplished up to that time, and could mention 183 churches to the restoration of which the Church Building Society had made grants, and more than thirty parishes in which either new or restored churches were in progress. Besides these others had been restored by private munificence; others, including the cathedral, by public subscription; many parsonages had been built, livings had been augmented, and education had been largely increased.¹ To all these excellent objects he had himself been a munificent contributor, and we believe that from the beginning to the end of his episcopate he spent nearly 40,000*l.* in charities of various kinds.² Yet with all these claims on the gratitude of the clergy we are sorry to say that he was not personally popular. It would have been more wonderful perhaps had he been so. The Welsh clergy forty years ago were a rough and uncultivated body of men, narrow-minded and prejudiced, and with habits hardly more civilized than those of the labourers around them. They were ill at ease with an English man of letters. He was to them an object of curiosity, possibly of dread. The new Bishop intimated his wish that the clergy should come to his house without restraint, and when there should be treated as gentlemen and equals. This was of itself an innovation. In his predecessor's time when a clergyman called at Abergwili he entered by the back door, and if he stayed to dinner he took that meal in the housekeeper's room with the upper servants. Thirlwall abolished these customs and entertained the clergy at his own table. This was excellent in intention, but impossible in practice. The difference in tastes, feelings, manners, between

¹ *Charges*, vol. ii. pp. 90-100.

² In his charge for 1851 (*Charges*, vol. i. p. 150) he announced his intention to devote the surplus of his income to the augmentation of small livings, and in 1866 he pointed out that the fund had up to that time yielded 24,000*l.* (*ibid.* vol. ii. p. 98).

the entertainer and the entertained made social intercourse equally disagreeable to both parties; and the Bishop felt obliged to substitute correspondence for visits, as far as he was able so to do, reserving personal intercourse for the archdeacons, or those clergymen whose education enabled them to appreciate his friendship.¹ Again, the peculiar tone of his mind must be remembered. He was nothing if not critical; and, further, as one of his oldest friends once said in our hearing, 'he was the most thoroughly voracious man I ever knew.' He could not listen to a hasty, ill-considered remark without taking it to pieces, and demonstrating, by successive questions, put in a slow, deliberate tone of voice, the fallacy of the separate parts of the proposition, and, by consequence, of the whole. Hence he was feared and respected rather than beloved; and those who ought to have been proud of having such a man among them wreaked their small spite against him by accusing him of being inhospitable, of walking out attended by a dog trained to know and bite a curate, and the like. These slanders, of which we hope he was unconscious, he could not answer; those who attacked him in public he could and did crush with an accuracy of exposition, and a power of sarcasm, for which it would be hard to find a parallel. We need only refer to his answers to Sir Benjamin Hall, M.P. for Marylebone, on the general question of the condition of the churches in his diocese, appended to his charge for 1851, and on the special case of the Collegiate Church of Brecon, in two letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury; or to the *Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams*, published in 1860. Mr. Williams had published some sermons, entitled *Rational Godliness*, the supposed heterodoxy of which had alarmed the clergy of his diocese, seventy of whom had signed a memorial to the Bishop, praying him to take some notice of the book: in other words, to remove the author from the college at Lampeter, of which he was vice-principal. The Bishop had declined to interfere, and in his charge of

¹ He particularly disliked gossip. At Kirby Underdale the old sexton used to relate how Mr. Thirlwall said, 'I never 'ears no tales;' and the following story shows that he maintained the same wise discretion after he became a bishop. One of his archdeacons thought it right to tell him that a certain clergyman in the diocese, who was a clever mimic, was fond of entertaining his friends with imitations of the Bishop. Thirlwall listened, and then inquired, 'Does he do me well?' 'I am sure I cannot say, my Lord,' replied the informer; 'I was never present myself at one of these disgraceful exhibitions.' 'Ah! I should like to know, because he does *you* admirably,' replied the Bishop. It is needless to say that no more stories were carried to his ears.

1857 had discussed the question at length, considering it, as was his manner, from all points of view, and, while he found much to blame, defending the author's intentions, on the ground of his own high opinion of his personal character. This, however, did not satisfy Mr. Williams. We cannot help suspecting that he was longing for a martyr's crown; and, indignant at not having obtained one, he addressed the Bishop at great length in what he called *An Earnestly Respectful Letter on the Difficulty of bringing Theological Questions to an Issue*. He described the charge as 'a miracle of cleverness,' but deplored its indefiniteness; he drew a picture of 'a preacher in our wild mountains' who came to seek counsel from his bishop and got only evasive answers—'in all helps for our guidance Abergwili may equal Delphi in wisdom, but also in ambiguity'—and entreated the Bishop to declare plainly his own opinion on the questions raised. For once Bishop Thirlwall's serenity was fairly ruffled. Stung by the ingratitude of a man whom he had steadily befriended, and whose aim was, as he thought, to draw him into admissions damaging to himself, he struck with all his might and main, and, as was said at the time, 'you may hear every bone in his adversary's body cracking.' One specimen of the remarkable power of his reply must suffice. On the comparison of himself to the Delphic oracle he remarked:—

'Even if I had laid claim to oracular wisdom I should have thought this complaint rather unreasonable; for the oracle at Delphi, though it pretended to divine infallibility, was used to wait for a question before it gave a response. But I wish above all things to be sure as to the person with whom I have to do. I remember to have read of one who went to the oracle at Delphi, "ex industria factus ad imitationem stultitiæ;" and I cannot help suspecting that I have before me one who has put on a similar disguise. The voice does not sound to me like that of a "mountain clergyman;" while I look at the roll I seem to recognize a very different and well-known hand. The "difficulties" are very unlike the expression of an embarrassment which has been really felt, but might have been invented in the hope of creating one. They are quite worthy of the mastery which you have attained in the art of putting questions, so as most effectually to prevent the possibility of an answer.'¹

But if Thirlwall's great merits were not fully appreciated in his own diocese there was no lack of recognition of them in the

¹ *An Earnestly Respectful Letter*, 8vo. 1860, pp. 20-23. See also *The Life and Letters of Rowland Williams, D.D.*, London, 1874, chap. xv., where his determination to make the Bishop declare himself, under the belief that he really agreed with him, is expressly stated.

² *A Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams*, 8vo. 1860, p. 19.

Chun
'did
is m
and
his i
for h
frien
most
the c
his u
of on
of th
comm
ent in
versia
spoke
life;
vanta
judici
perma
of the
and, v
not u
holdin
him a
bishop
his cl
feared
as an
circum
could
his O
reason
the ea
address
man v
episco
measu
a bish
speech
Civil I
ment
added

Church at large. Dean Perowne remarks most truly that he 'did not belong to the modern type of bishop, whose efficiency is measured in common estimation by his power of speech and motion.'¹ His seclusion at Abergwili largely increased his influence. It was known that he thought out questions for himself, without consulting his episcopal brethren or his friends, and without being influenced in any way, as even the most conscientious men must be, in despite of themselves, by the opinions which they hear expressed in society. Hence his utterances came to be accepted as the decisions of a judge; of one who, standing on an eminence, could take 'an oversight of the whole field of ecclesiastical events,'² and from that commanding position could distinguish what was of permanent importance from that which possessed a merely controversial interest as a vexed question of the day. We have spoken of the advantages which he derived from his secluded life; it must be admitted that it had also certain disadvantages. The freshness and originality of his opinions, the judicial tone of his independent decisions, gave them a permanent value; but his want of knowledge of the opinions of those from whom he could not wholly dissociate himself, and, we may add, his indifference to them, caused him to be not unfrequently misunderstood, and to be charged with holding views not far removed from heresy. 'I will not call him an unbeliever, but a misbeliever,' said a very orthodox bishop, whose love of epigram occasionally got the better of his charity. His brother bishops, like the Welsh clergy, feared him more than they loved him; they knew his value as an ally, but they knew also that he would never, under any circumstances, become a partizan or adopt a view which he could not wholly approve, merely because it seemed good to his Order to exhibit unanimity. It was probably for this reason, as much as for his eloquence and power, that he had the ear of the House of Lords on the rare occasions when he addressed it. The Peers knew that they were listening to a man who had the fullest sense of the responsibilities of the episcopate, but who would neither defend nor oppose a measure because 'the proprieties' indicated the side on which a bishop would be expected to vote. Two only of his speeches are republished in the collection before us—on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews (1848), and on the Disestablishment of the Irish Church (1869). We should like to have added to these that on the grant to the Roman Catholic College

¹ Preface to *Letters*, &c. p. vi.

² Dean Stanley's preface to the *Letters to a Friend*, p. xi.

of Maynooth (1845), which seems to us to be equally worth preserving. On these occasions Bishop Thirlwall took the unpopular side at periods of great excitement; his arguments were listened to with the utmost attention, and in the case of the Irish Church it has been stated that no speech had a greater effect in favour of the measure than his.

In all Church matters he was a thorough Liberal. His view of the Church of England cannot be better stated than by quoting a passage from one of his *Letters*. He had been reading Mr. Robertson's sermons; and after saying that their author was specially recommended to him by the hostility of the *Record*, 'which I consider as a proof of some excellence in every one who is its object,' he thus proceeds:—

'He was certainly not orthodox after the *Record* standard, but might very well be so after another. For our Church has the advantage—such I deem it—of more than one type of orthodoxy: that of the High Church, grounded on one aspect of its formularies; that of the Low Church, grounded on another aspect; and that of the Broad Church, striving to take in both, but in its own way. Each has a right to a standing-place, none to exclusive possession of the field. Of course this is very unsatisfactory to the bigots of each party—at the two extremes. Some would be glad to cast the others out; and some yearn after a living source of orthodoxy, of course on the condition that it sanctions their own views. To have escaped this worst of evils ought, I think, to console every rational Churchman for whatever he finds amiss at home.'

Had the Bishop added that he wished each of these parties to have fair play, but that none should be exalted at the expense of the others, we should have had a summary of the principles which regulated his public life. Let it not, however, be supposed that he was an indifferent looker-on. He held that truth had many sides; that it might be viewed in different ways by persons standing in different positions; but still it was to him clear, and definite, and based upon a rock which no human assailant could shake. This, we think, is the keynote which is struck in every one of those eleven most remarkable charges which are now for the first time collected together. We would earnestly commend them to the study of all who are interested in the history of the Church of England during the period which they cover. Every controversy which agitated her, every measure which affected her welfare, is discussed by a master hand; the real question at issue is carefully pointed out; the trivial is distinguished from the important; moderation and charity are insisted upon; angry passions are allayed; and while the liberty of

the individual is perpetually asserted the duty of maintaining her doctrines is strenuously inculcated. As illustrations of some of these characteristics we would contrast his exhaustive analysis of the Tractarian movement or the Gorham controversy with his conduct respecting *Essays and Reviews*. In the one case he hesitated to condemn; he preferred to allay the terror with which his clergy were evidently inspired. In the other, though always 'decidedly opposed to any attempt to narrow the freedom which the law allows to every clergyman of the Church of England in the expression of his opinion on theological subjects,' he joined his brother bishops in signing the famous 'Encyclical,' which we now know was the composition of Bishop Wilberforce, because he thought that in this case the principles advocated led to a negation of Christianity.

There were many other duties besides the care of the diocese of S. David's to which the Bishop devoted himself, but these we must dismiss with a passing notice. We allude to his work in Convocation, as a member of the Ritual Commission, and as chairman of the Old Testament Revision Company. Gradually, however, as years advanced, his physical powers began to fail, and he resolved to resign his bishopric. This resolution was carried into effect in 1874. He retired to Bath, where he was still able to continue many of his old pursuits, and by the help of his nephew and his family, and notwithstanding blindness and deafness, to maintain his old interests. He died rather suddenly at last, July 27, 1875, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, where, by a singularly felicitous arrangement, his remains were laid in the same grave as those of George Grote.

Regret has been often expressed that Bishop Thirlwall did not write more. We do not share this feeling. Had he written more he would have thought 'less, studied less, possessed in a less perfect degree that *'cor sapiens et intelligens ad discernendum judicium'*¹ which was never weary of trying to impart to others a portion of its own serenity. At seventy-six years of age, just before his resignation, he could say, 'I should hesitate to say that whatever is is best; but I have strong faith that it is *for* the best, and that the general stream of tendency is toward good;' and in the last sentence of his last charge he bade his clergy remark that even controversies were 'a sign of the love of truth which, if often passionate and one-sided, is always infinitely preferable to the quiet of apathy and indifference.'

¹ These words are inscribed upon Bishop Thirlwall's grave.
VOL. XVI.—NO. XXXI. K

ART. VII.—CLERGY PENSIONS.

1. *Church Finance.* By the Rev. PREBENDARY WOOD.
(London, 1874.)
2. *The Church and her Curates.* (London, 1874.)

IN our Review for April 1882 an article on 'The Position and Prospects of Curates' attracted considerable attention. After examining some of the theoretical disadvantages of the position of unbeneficed clergy of the Church of England, it suggested a method whereby many of these disadvantages might be either removed or modified by the establishment of a Pension Fund for all unbeneficed clergy reaching the age of sixty years; and laid down a scheme whereby such a measure might be easily effected in the case of all *future* entrants upon the ministry, if the bishops could be induced to act upon the terms of the proposal, and ordain (if necessary, seeking legal power for the purpose) candidates to deacon's orders at twenty-two years of age instead of at twenty-three; the condition of such earlier ordination being that they should not only be provided, as is now stipulated, with a title and sufficient stipend, but also with a paid-up claim to a pension of 100*l.*, in case of their being unbeneficed at sixty years of age. It was shown that a general payment of 50*l.* from each person so to be ordained would secure him such a pension, and that the candidate, being thus empowered during his twenty-third year to earn a curate's stipend (averaging 125*l.*), while at present he can earn nothing, would, under these circumstances, be not only secure against want in old age, but be better off than at present by 75*l.*

The subject was brought forward by its proposer, the Rev. W. L. Blackley, Rector of North Waltham, at the annual meeting of the Curates' Augmentation Fund, and again at the Derby Church Congress, and has met with very favourable opinions from several members of the episcopate.

There seems, no reason why a proposal of so considerable advantage both to Church and Churchmen should not, by-and-by, be introduced into practice. In any case its putting forward has awakened a considerable and widely spreading interest in the question of clergy pensions, which we trust will not be allowed to languish, and which may make welcome an article on pensions obtainable not merely by candidates for

holy orders, but by all the unbeneficed clergy at every period of their ministry.

We propose, in its course—

I. Firstly to examine suggestions often made for securing clergy pensions from church endowments, and show their general impracticability;

II. Next we will indicate the source whence part of the funds requisite for such provision should reasonably be sought for; and

III. We will put forward certain statistics and calculations tending, we trust, to show at what unexpectedly small cost to the contributors, and with what possibly very large advantage to the Church itself, the desired provision may be generally secured.

It will be well, before explaining the sort of organization we should aim at establishing, to make very clear the sort we ought not to strive for, at least at first. And this excludes a good many excellent proposals from our purview. We must have a national institution, not a diocesan one (which, for instance, excludes the excellent proposal made by the Rev. H. B. Rawnsley, Vicar of Wray, near Ambleside); for any merely diocesan society must more or less act in limitation of what among the ordinary wage-earning class is described as 'migration of labour.' And, as we must aim at laying a foundation stone of clerical independence before we can carve a coping stone for the completion of clerical comfort, we must also leave out of view at present all proposals for life insurance (such, for instance, as that most ingenious and interesting one established in the diocese of Bangor, chiefly owing to the sound and thoughtful elaboration of the Rev. Warren Trevor, Vicar of Penman, Beaumaris).

Probably many readers will be rather shocked at this cool exclusion from consideration of those very efforts which they are accustomed to consider the most desirable and the most duty-doing for men whose income depends upon their life; but we must refer them to the title of our article to show that, though clergy pensions and provision for clergymen's families may both be secured by insurances, the things themselves in object and essence are entirely distinct.

The purchase of a pension provides *for a man himself* in his lifetime; the insuring of a man's life can only possibly provide *for other people*. That his children shall receive a hundred pounds a year at a clergyman's death is, no doubt, very desirable for them; but that he himself should have it for his own needs, and perhaps for his own existence, is another

matter, and of much earlier importance, since, if he cannot provide for his own existence, the children depending on him may starve while waiting for his death to give them their provision.

For this plain reason we leave out of our present consideration everything but the securing of retiring pensions, feeling that once the independence of the individual clergyman is assured he will be in a far more advantageous position than otherwise for providing for those whom he may have to leave behind him.

Nor let this be a discouraging consideration; for once the pension fund fully established, understood, and introduced, it will afford an otherwise unattainable firm basis on which to build up other sections of clerical provision, on which at last the coping stone of completion may be fitly placed, and so the work be crowned.

I. With regard to overcoming the admitted difficulty of provision by any large number of our clergy, benefited or unbeneficed, but more especially the latter, there are some very favourite and very foolish suggestions continually made, the pertinence of which it may be well for us to demolish beforehand.

One of these is the systematical readjustment of Church endowments generally, by reducing the larger livings and enlarging the smaller ones. This course is commonly suggested and advocated by persons who happen to know of one living having a large income and small population, and perhaps of three or four with a small income and large population. But the plan is never pressed by reasonable men when once they have made one single step into the necessary statistics of the subject.

For, apart from the fact that no adjustment of income could, if desirable, ever be final, so long as population fluctuates, not only in parishes urban or rural, but even in counties (of which we have a most striking instance in the Cornwall of 1881 having a population of only nine-tenths of the Cornwall of 1871), the first examination of the figures would show how little any equalization of Church endowments could do towards providing any true adequacy of clerical income to immediate needs, to say nothing of future provision. For to apportion the entire clerical income of England equally between all clerics, making no difference between an archbishop and a newly-ordained deacon, would only give each one a stipend of 242*l.* gross, which, when necessary deductions were made, would leave a smaller *net*

income for each man ordained. Suppose we placed that average sum at 220*l.* : what amount of this would our would-be reformers consider each clergyman could spare, after defraying all current expenses, to provide retiring pension for his own old age and life insurance for those dependent upon him?

Another sapient suggestion is that of laying hands upon the firstfruits and tenths of Queen Anne's Bounty, which can only be seriously suggested, as likely to produce an adequate amount for the purpose in view, by people who have no notion whatever of what the firstfruits are; who imagine possibly that they are full first year's incomes on every living, instead of being levies merely of the sum at which the living was estimated years ago 'in the King's books;' and who are unaware that even such firstfruits on such livings only accrue, on an average, once in sixteen years, that being the average length of time that any one living is held by any one incumbent. Now, as every beneficed man has already paid his firstfruits, it is plain that the proposed clergy pensions, if drawn from this source, must be provided only by future and not by present incumbents. The money, therefore, to be realized by such a method would amount to a mere flea-bite as compared with the sum needed for a General Clergy Pension Fund, and is being applied to a far more practical purpose at the present time.

Akin to this expedient is the bolder one of taxing all clerical incomes, to whatever extent the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty may think expedient, by a uniform percentage sufficient to retire every clergyman who chooses on 100*l.* a year at a stated age. Apart from the absolute incalculability of such a tax (from the impossibility of ascertaining with certainty beforehand who might be willing to avail themselves of such a pension), and leaving out of view the weighty consideration that in proportion as such a scheme included those clergy nearest the pension age at the time of its establishment more or less gratuitously, or on equal terms with all younger men, it would really be doing an extreme injustice while establishing the evil principle of a Clerical Poor Law, and tending thus to pauperize and degrade the clerical profession.

And it would have another and very injurious effect upon the Church itself and Church work generally in diminishing the number of curates employed. For, if the appointing and paying of a curate were, in any case except that of an incumbent's physical inability to officiate, a compulsory matter,

and a condition of any man holding a benefice, a compulsory insurance for that curate's contingent necessity, if we can conceive it enacted, might be raised; apart from the policy, the justice, or the proportion of cost, the law might compel the tax, just as, at the present time, it succeeds in the compulsory collection of poor rates. But the employment of curates being uncompellable, as it is, the immediate effect of any such measure would obviously be to diminish the number of curates employed. As this is an important point to make clear, we must enlarge a little upon it.

Because so many incumbents employ curates, a very general idea exists that they are bound to employ them; than which no error is more common, and very few have been productive of greater injury both to the interests of the Church of England itself and to the true Church spirit of her members, clerical and lay alike. Unless in the very rare cases where an endowment exists for the purpose, no incumbent in the Church of England is bound to supply any ministrations except his own. The piety of our ancestors endowed our churches, but in each case provided for the services of one ordained man to do the work of each parish. Where and when that man is proved unfit or unable to discharge his duties his stipend is rightly chargeable with the support of a substitute; but in no other circumstances is he under any sort of obligation to provide the parish with ministrations of other ordained men than himself.

This is a true principle, which needs in the present day to be frankly stated and upheld. For so constantly do our beneficed clergy accept, as a matter of zeal and conscience, what is no matter of law or compulsion, that even bishops will think it no unreasonable thing to say, in offering a living to a clergyman, 'The population is a large one, and will require (or cannot be worked without) one, or two, or three curates;' and the nominee will conscientiously accept such a hint as involving the payment for such curates out of his clerical income, and will undertake it cheerfully, though by so doing he is simply undertaking what is really the duty of other people, and thus pauperizing the Church people who should provide for the Church's immediate needs, and who would do so if the burden, which, divided among all, would be trifling, were not voluntarily borne by the too willing shoulders of one whose life and work and usefulness that burden crushes from the outset.

It is estimated¹ by the Rev. A. Mackreth Deane, a skilled

¹ In *The Church and her Curates*, cited at head of this article.

authority on the subject, that the incumbents of the Church of England pay from their own pockets no less a sum than 400,000*l.* annually out of the 687,000*l.* expended in curates' stipends. Plainly that is paid only by the comparatively small section who employ stipendiary curates at all. What proportion these bear to the whole number of incumbents we cannot accurately say, but the following return of the single diocese of Winchester may give us an approximation. In this diocese there are altogether 551 benefices, in which are employed 262 curates.¹ Of these benefices 47 employ more than one curate, absorbing an aggregate of 114, while the remaining 148 are employed in 148 separate benefices. Out of 551 benefices, therefore, curates are employed in only 195—that is, in 35 parishes per cent., or, in round numbers, in every third parish.

Now it being perfectly well known that, except in the very rare cases² of actually disabling physical infirmity, the employment of curates cannot be compelled, we find that 400,000*l.* is being *voluntarily* paid by one-third of the incumbents of the Church of England out of their professional income, not to relieve themselves from parochial work, but to get more parochial work done than they can do, or are bound to do, themselves.

Taking, then, the net incomes of the beneficed clergy at 3,000,000*l.*, we find that one-third of them—those who employ curates—are spending out of their professional income of 1,000,000*l.* no less than 400,000*l.* a year, or 40 per cent., for pure zeal in the work of God and the Church.

No other class of men in the universe can be shown to be doing anything so generous and self-denying as this; and, we may add, nothing but the greatness of the cause they toil for could induce so large and constant a self-sacrifice. Of course there are known to be many beneficed men of private wealth who spend far more than their whole clerical income in the work of the parishes they are set over, as also there are known to be many of what seem to be the richest livings in England of which it is equally well known that no poor

¹ The general information on pp. 1-72 inclusive of the *Winchester Diocesan Calendar*, which, we believe, is prefixed in block to the calendars of many other dioceses, gives (under the summary of the bishopric, p. 16) the number of benefices as 529 and of curates as 400. The figures we have quoted above are careful corrections of these hasty generalizations, and show the existence of a much smaller proportion of curates to beneficed men than is commonly supposed to obtain.

² Against which we set *all clerical contributions* to curate-paying societies.

man can accept the charge at all.¹ This is one of the simple explanations of what ignorant enemies of the Church and her rulers make such an empty but mischievous outcry over, when, time after time, a bishop appoints to a large living some scion of nobility, or person otherwise supposed to be wealthily provided, and leaves a number of 'poor curates' unpromoted. But, apart from all such rich men who bring their gifts into the treasury, the vast majority of the curate-employing incumbents are bringing their ungrudged mites and doing for their parishes to the very utmost of their means and far beyond their duty. To add to these unsupported men's burden of providing stipends for curates, which the public generally lays upon them, while unwilling to touch it with a finger, the cost of providing pensions as well as stipends would be laying on indeed the familiar 'last straw' to break the camel's back.

But it would be much more than a straw. As the average duration of ministerial life is forty years (the average age of the clergy at death being sixty-four), to provide pensions would be to add to present burdens the cost of four years of life—that is, one-tenth, or ten per cent. of clerical existence—and this would not be in the power, however readily it might be in the will, of the beneficed clergy. If, therefore, any such measure became a law, the overburdening would correct itself, like a top-heavy iceberg, but in a way which, while relieving the clergy, would injure the laity. The man (and there are thousands such) who, doing his utmost possible to pay curates' stipends, was called on to do the utterly impossible in order to pension them, would simply diminish the responsibility and cost of providing pensions by ceasing to employ curates to claim them; there would be less Church work done, fewer posts for curates to occupy, smaller earnings, more need of pensions, and smaller contributions to levy for their supply. Under these peculiar circumstances anything like a general taxation of all clerical incomes, in order to provide retiring allowances, seems entirely out of the question, however reasonable such a measure might be in numberless other occupations where the employment of labour is an investment on the employer's part essential to his worldly profit, not (as, for the most part, in the appointment of curates in the Church) a self-denial on the employer's part carried already, for godliness and not for gain, to the very last verge of possibility,

¹ Instance Pontefract Vicarage, nominal net value 330*l.* A late wealthy vicar collected no tithe at all for more than twenty-five years; all tithes are now refused, and the endowment practically extinguished.

and susceptible of no greater expenditure than is so nobly borne to-day.

II. These various suggested measures of supplying a pension fund for the clergy appearing, as they do to us, on closer examination as well inadequate if permitted, impracticable if accepted, and injurious if practicable, we may dismiss them under the general conviction that any such provision for the needs of the clergy of to-day proposed to be subtracted from the small provision made ages ago for the subsistence of half as many clergy as we now have in supply of one-tenth of our present population, would be simply, as to its equity, a robbing of Peter to pay Paul, and, as to its reasonableness, as wise as to urge on a grown man the duty of keeping himself thoroughly warm with a baby's frock. It is not because the clergy are dependent-spirited, but because sufficient provision for retirement and pension from existing Church endowments is impossible, that every scheme proposed for effecting so urgently desirable an object must look beyond existing Church endowments for part at least of the means required. In a word, they would all call upon the laity to take a share in the provision of a fund. And most fairly and reasonably, as we shall now endeavour to show,

There never probably has been a race of men so completely pauperized, in the ministerial sense, as the laity of the Church of England. More than a thousand years ago certain people whom we call our ancestors, but cannot really prove to have been so, endowed the Church of England (which the law of England adopted and fitted itself to, but never really *established* at all) with the tithes of the land. Those men did the Christian duty of providing sustenance for Church workers. They gave up the tithe of *their* land for ever. No generation of Englishmen has ever done the like thing since. Each in succession they have been content to live, so far as the provision of spiritual ministrations goes, on the parochial alms of their predecessors. From time immemorial, by a universal prescription, the English people have been taught to claim spiritual sustenance (as many centuries later they were taught by our Poor Law to claim bodily sustenance) not from their own, but from other people's, purses. That some, and even many, especially in our own days and in the last half-century, have given nobly and gloriously of their goods for Church purposes is worthy of acknowledgment and redounds to their credit; but the credit, after all, is of a negative sort, since their act is only comparatively noble, showing them not liberal above their conscientious

duty, but liberal only above the illiberality of their unconscientious neighbours. And these men are exceptions, after all; the vast mass of the people who claim and use the ministrations of the Church of England do practically nothing at all towards its support. Witness to this fact is to be found in the extreme difficulty, especially in country parishes, of scraping together, by offertories or voluntary subscriptions, even the fractional sums required each year, not for the stipends of the ministers, but for the small necessary expenses of maintaining the fabrics and the services.

The effect of this spiritual pauperization is plain, whatever its source, though we cannot doubt that ignorance on the subject (which the clergy, from comprehensible delicacy of feeling, are shy to enlighten) has much to do with the parsimony so painfully evident.

For when a nominal member of the Church joins any one of the sects he passes (indeed, is compelled to pass) from spiritual pauperism to spiritual independence at once, and does not hesitate to pay his fair contribution to the support of his chosen minister and the repair or purchase of his favourite chapel.

Therefore we should enlighten the ignorance which exists on these points among our Church members, and open their eyes to the imperative and reasonable call upon them to do their share in aiding the efficiency of the Church and the independence of her ministers by contribution, if not to the endowment of the beneficed man, at least to the pensioning of the unbeneficed, the worn-out men whose lives have been spent in the service of the Church, admittedly without sufficient remuneration.

Such systematic enlightenment would, no doubt, stimulate a good many of our Church people at all events to comprehend their duty in this direction, though of course the mere pointing out of the duty is but a small matter as compared with getting the duty done.

Every scheme for bettering the condition of the clergy which we have ever heard of (and they are very many) uses the arguments we have used, and draws the perhaps natural if too sanguine inference, 'Our people have only to hear these things, and they will be sure to remedy the wrong which exists.' But it is too often forgotten that good meanings come to nothing unless married to good methods. Some machinery is wanted to elicit, collect, secure, and apportion those sums which we are always so ready to assume that the awakened liberality of our Church members will be willing to contribute.

188
mo
tion
ne
Ch
cle
ma
in
off
tha
hav
by
rea

ide
qu
Wo
whi
arti

port
cont
for
visio
both
ordin
sider
mini
in th
the m
of th
all S
and
appro
once
only
dioc
Offer
and w

I
this?
poor
it wo

1 A
salient
unread

Such a machinery, the oldest, the most reasonable, the most legitimate known, exists at our hands, a slight modification, not in the form but in the use of which, suggested nearly ten years ago by the Rev. Prebendary Wood, of Christ Church, Bath, might be instrumental in vastly stimulating the clergy to efforts which all men should be encouraged to make of their own accord, by way of provision against want in old age. This machinery, we need hardly say, is the offertory of our Church, and we cannot but express surprise that a proposal so reasonable and so hopeful should so long have been before the public without some steps being taken by thoughtful and influential men to carry its simple and reasonable suggestions into effect.

Premising that we shall put forward somewhat modified ideas as to the application of such a fund when raised, we will quote, as regards the method of raising it, from Prebendary Wood's interesting pamphlet on the subject, the title of which, *Church Finance*, we have cited at the head of our article.

'It is proposed,' he says, 'that a fund be raised, towards which a portion of the alms made at each Sacramental collection should be contributed. This will be strictly in accordance with Holy Scripture, for both under the Old as well as under the New Testament provision was to be made for God's ministers. Under the Old Testament both the priest and the Levite were to be provided for under settled ordinances by God's own appointment; and even care and consideration were to be extended towards the aged and worn-out ministers of God. Under the New we have ample directions given in the Apostolic writings; and we have them enshrined for use in the most important formulary of the Church. Now if these sentences of the Communion Service were constantly used,¹ and *one-tenth of all Sacramental alms collected for the poor were set apart for the sick and disabled clergy*, who but must admit that such a division and appropriation would be both reasonable and suitable? If this were once established it will naturally be self-sustaining and flow on, and the only effort will be to remit the money once or twice a year to the diocesan treasurer. The words of Holy Scripture *always used in the Offertory at the Holy Communion* will of themselves plead with power, and we believe with efficacy, on behalf of the sick and disabled clergy.'

Is there any objection to be made to such a proposal as this? Let us see before going further. It would deprive the poor of a portion of the Church's alms, is the first objection; it would be robbing them to enrich the clergy. Firstly, we

¹ As a fact, just because the alms are never thus applied, the most salient and striking texts in the Offertory are systematically passed over unread. We mean, of course, the 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, and 14th.

reply that this does not follow in the least ; the putting such a just, righteous, and beneficent object before our congregations may far more reasonably be assumed likely to augment the collections than to diminish them ; and to uphold this argument for a moment on logical grounds will compel an objector to give a definition of 'the poor,' from which he will find it very hard to exclude hundreds of struggling, toiling, almost starving unbeneficed men, for whose absolute want, when their working days are over, the whole body of Churchmen should contribute some fraction of provision.

Or, again, we may hear, 'This will deprive the clergy of a tenth part of their means of aiding temporal distress among their congregations.' We can only say with all the emphasis in our power that their deprivation of the other nine-tenths as well would be one of the greatest practical advantages to their influence and the work of the Church which can readily be conceived. The 'serving of tables' by the clergy, which is so general in the Church of England, is a cruel waste of ministerial energy, while it fills their deserving poor with a sense of injustice and their undeserving with hypocrisy and deceit. There are no worse almoners than our unfortunate clergy, and the fact of their being so at all has wofully corrupted our people. Many of these measure their minister by his money and not by his morals ; we have taught them a far worse simony than that so commonly misdescribed under the name, so that men who are ready to give heed to a Simon Magus, who scatters shillings, as the great power of God, would despise a Simon Peter who should repeat to-day, 'Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.'

Can any other objections be thought of against this reasonable use of a tenth part of the offertory ? We doubt it ; and as, after all, it is only those who contribute the offertory who have the slightest right to object, there is no reason, should one such qualified objector exist, why he should not specially assign his offering, if he think fit, to any strictly parochial use he may prefer. The reasonableness of the theory is clear. A great step might be made at any time by the bishops (if possible simultaneously) notifying their opinion, either by a resolution in Convocation or through their rural deans, that some such use of a part of the offertory was both primitive, reasonable, and desirable.

Thus we have indicated a source whence the nucleus of a fund for clergy pensions might flow. The argument for its collection would be immensely strengthened if it were made clear from the first to the contributors that their benefactions

were intended to elicit, not to extinguish, vigorous efforts on the part of the clergy to make independent provision for themselves. Therefore, as it seems to us, so far as this money is applied to pensions, it should *in no one case* be allotted unless met by a corresponding effort on the part of the intending pensioner or on his behalf.

Again, the proportion contributed to the fund by any parish may be reasonably supposed likely to be larger if the contributors were distinctly aware that the money they gave would in the first instance benefit their own unbeneficed clergy, a condition which would be attached to all remittances. And the same result in a further degree would probably flow from their understanding that the advantage offered to their own curate would be definite and unprecario, giving him not the means merely of paying one or two annual premiums, which he might forfeit by future inability to keep up, but securing for each year of his parochial service a paid-up and inalienable claim to a certain definite sum, say 10*l.*, conditional only on his reaching a certain definite age, say sixty years, and not being holder of a benefice.

We will suppose, then, the origination of such a fund as has been described, to be drawn from, say, one-tenth of the offertory collections throughout the country, and handed over to a corporation for administration. This might well be that organization already in existence for promoting a different object, the Curates' Augmentation Fund, which might add the words 'and Pension' before 'Fund' in its title. We suggest this because this new fund would be based on the certainty of a very large surplus, which might in time be used, most properly, in extending the special augmentation of curates' stipends, which that society is formed to promote. Of course we do not assume that all, or any special number, of the parishes in England will by their ministers and churchwardens fall in with the idea of tithing the Sacramental collections for the purpose of clergy superannuation; the benefits of the scheme we propose will be only shared by the parishes which do; but we will by-and-by show reason to hope that the benefits offered will be sufficient to induce most parishes which have the advantage of a curate's services to contribute in the manner proposed.

III. We come, thirdly, to consider the statistical bases on which the payments for such an assurance would be founded, and the calculations required to establish the proposed rate of contributions and ensure the promised amount of benefit. We will suppose such a corporation established, to receive

the proportional collection from the Sacramental offertories of any parishes which are willing to contribute to the fund. We have already calculated that curates are employed, on an average, in the case of one parish out of three in the country; and the fact of the employment of a curate for the most part implies a considerable population—let us say, on the average, 2,000 persons. Where these populations do not consist of the very poorest classes it cannot be an unreasonable calculation to place the average Sacramental offertories at a yearly amount of, let us say, 50*l.* or more; a tenth of this would give 5*l.* a year or more for the proposed fund. Let us next see how this should be dealt with. The trustees of the fund would bind themselves to offer annually, on receipt of this sum of at least 5*l.*, that sum to the curate of the parish (if he had served it for the preceding twelve months), *on condition of his meeting* that amount with a supplementary sum sufficient to complete a so-called 'positive' assurance with the trustees of 10*l.* a year, conditional on his completing the age of sixty and not holding any benefice. (It may be noted, in passing, that his having held a benefice and resigned it will by no means vitiate his claim for pension, and that, should he, after becoming a pensioner, accept a living, he only forfeits the pension while holding the living, and can reclaim it when he resigns.) So long as the parish contributes at least 5*l.* yearly to the fund, the curate will receive the same offer annually until he have secured ten positive pensions of 10*l.* a year, amounting together to 100*l.* a year. In this way the fund can never fail, for it will never issue a pension not fully paid up in advance, and the curate who leaves one parish for another will have received for each year of his service in each parish in which he has worked an equal proportion of supplement to prevent his coming to want in old age. There need be no feeling of the eleemosynary sort in such an arrangement; no valuers of Eucharistic privileges would ever feel otherwise than that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and many of them would contribute gladly and largely besides to such a fund as is suggested if based on sound and infallible principles.

Nor should any false pride make the recipient, even if otherwise provided, hesitate to avail himself of that recognition of service which his work would have earned. For the advantage of his order, and of his brethren less well provided than himself, he should, on the contrary, not only accept, but stipulate with his rector for having, the offer made to him each year by the trustees, whether he refused and left the sum to swell the fund or proceeded to secure his pension.

If, on the other hand, a curate, having this offer made to him year by year, refuse to accept it from simple unwillingness to make any effort whatever on his own account for the securing of a provision for his old age, he would only have himself, and not the Church or the flocks he has served, to blame for his destitution, while the sum refused would swell the fund for wiser men.

But, it may be said, this proposed method of collecting 5*l.* a year for ten years of each curate's working life from each parish in which a curate is employed, assumes, if it is to offer its great benefits to every curate, as it ought, that the offertories in every such parish must amount to 50*l.* a year, and that there are to be no parishes with more than one curate. We must meet this reasonable objection. It is presumable that where more curates are needed there are more communicants to contribute, and that the offertories will be proportionally larger. But this is met by saying that some large parishes will be too poor at all times to contribute. We would ask then who provides their curates' stipend. In such cases we shall find them very commonly derived from the Additional Curates Society, the Pastoral-Aid Society, and other sources for spiritual aid. Why should not these stipulate in making their grants to deduct from the grant enough to supplement the deficiency of 5*l.* to be offered to the curate whose stipend they provide at the end of each year of his service? For the great advantage of the Church herself, and the curates as well, such a stipulation might most reasonably be made. It may be said this would be to make the curate pay the whole sum; but this would not really be the case if these societies subjected all their grants to this reasonable condition until each recipient had secured his ten pensions.

And this modification is of course only suggested in the case of such very poor parishes as could not be hoped to produce 5*l.* from their offertory for each curate. The societies might reasonably, taking such a point as this into consideration, make their grants a little larger, for this very purpose, to the poorest parishes, and proportionally smaller to those better able to contribute the required sum from the offertory.

And, again, the machinery of the proposed fund might be made use of by anybody who, from regard or gratitude, wished to provide a paid-up pension, or part of one, to any curate; he might simply pay the money, and the society would send the completed policy to the curate. It would be inalienable and secure, and would leave the parish contributions from offertory free for other purposes of the fund.

That the fund itself must grow, and grow largely, is plain from the following considerations. Firstly, if once generally adopted with episcopal sanction and recommendation (and what bishop would fail to welcome and foster such an undertaking?), a vast number of parishes which have no curates would send at least *something* a year as a tenth of their offertory. Again, very many parishes sending a tenth would send a very much larger sum than would supply 5% for offering pensions to each of their own curates. Thirdly, many well-provided men would, in one way or another, prevent themselves from burdening the fund at all, giving back, so to speak, with the one hand what they received with the other. Fourthly, the offertory tenths of all parishes whose curates had secured ten 10% pensions would swell the fund without deduction; and, fifthly, the very existence of a system so hopeful and reasonable would encourage many important gifts and legacies. We have it on the authority of more than one eminent lawyer that many clients at the present time, in making their testamentary arrangements, make earnest and often vain inquiries as to some good clergy fund, in order to benefit some special persons or parishes, and would gladly avail themselves for carrying out their intentions of such an institution as is here proposed.

All these considerations tend to show that the undertaking of such a business as here suggested by the Curates' Augmentation Fund would, so far from involving it in any risk, tend infallibly to the creation of a surplus, which, as often as ascertained, would aid the fund in a most important way towards carrying out fully its first declared object of bettering the condition of stipendiary curates of long service.

And, were this not sufficient, the tabulations we have made for the proposed assurance cost being based, as we shall show, on payments largely exceeding the exact necessary cost, the contributors to the offertory collections might be perfectly secure that the tithe of their gifts would not only aid the pensioning of the curates who minister among them, but become largely instrumental besides in bettering the general condition of the beneficed clergy in other directions.

We come, lastly, to consider the amounts of contribution which would be required from the unbeneficed men to secure one by one this series of ten pensions, each of 10% a year. Of course this sum must vary with the age at which the pensions are secured. A young man necessarily must pay much less than an older one, though towards middle clerical life we may point out a happy modification in further aid of

the
cur
per
sec
onl
ma
tion
how
and
per
of
spe
it i
Off
soc
two
cos
will
is t
real
The
gro

each
whe
add
plain
with
pay
for t
and
stea
year
men
to b
ages
by t

Age

30
32
34
36
40

VO

the individual effort required. By the Post Office tables a curate aged 24 next birthday, in order to secure a paid-up pension of 100*l.* at 60, would have to pay down 183*l.* 15*s.*; to secure a 10*l.* pension, 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* But such a pension, the only cheap and safe one he could at all secure without such a machinery as we have suggested, would be his without conditions of any sort except his reaching the age of 60 years. As, however, the fund we suggest would condition its pensions by another stipulation—namely, that the clergyman receiving the pension shall be holding no benefice—and as two out of three of the whole number of clergy hold benefices, and, generally speaking, far more than two out of three over 60 years old do, it is plain that with such conditioning one-third of the Post Office money would be sufficient to buy the pensions in a society established *ad hoc*. Therefore, for the curate after twelve months' work to buy a paid-up pension of 10*l.* would cost 6*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; if, then, 5*l.* be offered to him by the fund he will only himself need to supplement it by 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* That is to say, in practice he will be offered a value, otherwise unrealizable, of 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* for the small amount of 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* The man who will refuse this will have no right, when he grows old, to complain of want of provision.

This, of course, is the lowest rate, and must increase in each successive year, so that, at the age of 34 next birthday, when buying his tenth and last pension, he would have to add 4*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* to the 5*l.*, instead of 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* As it is very plain that the older the man grows the more he wants to do with his money, we would therefore suggest that each man, in paying for his first pension, should, instead of the smaller sum for the special year, pay the *average* sum for each of ten years, and thus supplement the 5*l.* offer by 2*l.* 12*s.* 3*d.* each year, instead of by 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* the first, increasing to 4*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* the last year. We will see next how this proposal would affect older men. The following are the first and the *average* supplements to be undertaken by pension buyers at the undermentioned ages, and the Post Office real value in each case obtainable by the money:—

Age	Benefaction	First Year	Ten Years' Average	Real Value, Post Office
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
30	5 0 0	3 3 10	4 19 5	24 11 0
32	5 0 0	4 4 2	6 7 6	26 8 4
34	5 0 0	4 9 9	6 17 5	28 18 4
36	5 0 0	5 10 7	8 0 10	31 11 8
40	10 0 0	2 12 6	5 13 3	37 17 6

As already hinted, and as this table shows, a modification specially advantageous to the older men comes into operation about the age of 40; for then the unbeneficed men become, after 15 years' service, eligible for grants from that very fund, to which for this special reason we would affiliate the insurances, the Curates' Augmentation; and though that society might not be able to give each of them its proposed 100*l.* a year additional income, it might most reasonably give each of them 5*l.* to be applied towards purchasing pensions up to 100*l.* at 60, which would set the Augmentation Fund free from further grants in the case of all who survived for pension. Thus, supposing a curate aged 40 to have made no pension assurance before, he might, by paying 5*l.* odd a year for ten years, in complement of 5*l.* from his parish and 5*l.* from the Curates' Augmentation Fund, be certain of 100*l.* pension whether he continued to work as a curate or retired from clerical work altogether at 60 years of age.

What, however, would be done in the case of parishes which made no offertory tithe, and thus failed to provide a means of pension for the curates from whose services they received benefit? The practical effect, if the plan were generally taken up, would be to raise the ordinary stipend required for a curate's services in such parishes by 5*l.* a year, since in most other parishes the curate could count on receiving a money value of 5*l.* in addition to the ordinary stipend. The curate serving such a parish would receive 5*l.* a year more than otherwise, and if he chose might spend that sum, with its supplement, in buying each year a 10*l.* pension. Otherwise he would have no pension, of course, but could blame no one but himself for his neglect.

It is not unreasonable that we should be expected to enter into some detail, which need not be uninteresting, of the grounds on which we are bold to assert that pensions, paid up in one sum, for unbeneficed clergy may be issued, not only with perfect financial safety, but with great financial advantage, at one-third of the ordinary cost of unconditional pensions, by such a corporation as we have indicated. Broadly taken, we have estimated that, as there are more than twice as many benefices (and presumably beneficed men to hold them) in the Church of England than there are unbeneficed men, we can therefore estimate further that, if only one in every three could be at the same time unbeneficed, a system which receives payment from all the individuals of a class, while only every third one can draw the benefit, may be established at a third of the ordinary cost. We shall show

presently statistical reasons proving even this third a high estimate.

But we shall be met by the assertion that, though the proposal may embrace all the clergy, a large enough number will, of their own accord, remain outside it, to vitiate the calculations; or, in other words, that a large number of men will be so satisfied of never requiring a pension at all that they will not contribute to the funds.

There might be some force in this objection if all men were able to know beforehand what posts they would obtain in the Church. But as, in order to establish such a fund as we propose on a sound financial basis, we do not for a moment require its universal adoption, but only to calculate the average ministerial history of the average Church of England clergyman, the proportion of those who may or may not avail themselves of the proposal does not in the least appreciable degree affect the average cost at which all who do, be their number large or small, may be assured. We have, in order to find a sound basis for estimate, made two inductions, each of one thousand consecutive names of clergymen, as they stand in the pages of *Crockford* for 1881, selecting the two lists from different parts of the book (pp. 482-528 and 906-951).

We have taken the average age of ordination as twenty-five years, and, as the volume for 1881 contains only the names of clergy existing in 1880, we have gone back thirty-five years—that is, to the year 1845—and find the number of men ordained in or before that year (that is, of sixty years of age), to be 406 out of the 2,000.

Incidentally we may remark also a very strong contrast in the value of livings held by clergy after their sixtieth year and those held by all clergy at all ages.

The Rev. A. Mackreth Deane, an authority already quoted, estimates the number of livings held by *all clergy at all ages*, with income under 200*l.* a year, to be about 5,573, as compared with 7,727 livings so held of a higher value; we may take his numbers approximately as 5 to 7.

But our own induction shows the number of livings held by *clergy above 60 years of age* with income under 200*l.* to be only 63 as compared with 276 livings so held of a higher value, or approximately as 5 to 22.

This extraordinary difference, so likely to be overlooked in any hasty view of the subject, is at once explained when we remember that each promotion a man receives as he grows older naturally moves him on, from holding smaller

benefices in his younger days, to holding larger ones in his older.

However arising, it must manifestly cheapen the insurance cost proposed to a considerable degree. There would, however, be necessarily a large correction required to meet stimulated resignation, since the power to claim pension, if unbeneficed, at 60 years of age would induce most holders of the smaller livings, say under 100*l.* a year, to retire at 60, and of those under, say, 200*l.* to retire at 66, which appears to be the average age at which retirements due to physical infirmity take place.¹ But, seeing how few clergy of pension age hold small enough livings to be induced to retire for a 100*l.* pension, the correction of the estimate as applies to men above 60 years of age would be vastly smaller than as applied to all ages.

We give a table containing the result of our inductions, which will enable a simple calculation to be made of the average number of persons contributing to such a pension fund as we have proposed who would ultimately become chargeable to its funds.

Number of clergy examined	2,000
Number of those above 60 years	406
1. Of whom holding livings under 200 <i>l.</i> net *	63
2. „ holding livings over 200 <i>l.</i> net *	276
3. „ retired from benefices	36
4. „ otherwise provided	15
5. „ never beneficed	16
	— 406
7. Average years served by retired incumbents . . .	41

* Besides value of residences.

Noting the remarkable fact that only sixteen men out of 2,000 ordained reach the age of 60 without being beneficed (for the fifteen in class 4, called 'otherwise provided,' are either holders of public positions equivalent to benefices or entitled to pensions for public service, which should be made to exclude from participation in the assurance fund in the same way as the holding of a benefice does), we proceed to apply the tabulation. Taking the gross result of this table first, we see that, out of 406 individuals of the pension age, classes 1 and 2, together holding 339 benefices, and class 4, the fifteen men 'otherwise provided,' or together 354 individuals, would be

¹ The signal incidental advantage of this consideration, as tending in a remarkable degree to shorten the average of unbeneficed service, by hastening the resignation of the smaller livings by aged men, must not be left out of view.

disqualified, by holding benefices, from claiming pension; leaving class 3, the clergy retired from benefices, and class 5, those never beneficed, together 52, entitled to draw upon the fund. In round numbers, only one in every eight could make good his claim; therefore, presumably, as little as an eighth part of the ordinary Post Office sum would suffice to secure the provision.

But we must make here some liberal corrections regarding the important question of the increase in resignations of livings, and consequently of drawers upon the fund which this right to pension would induce.

Our return under class 3 gives us the proportion of those over 60 now voluntarily retired as 36 to 406, say 1 to 11. But their retirement, as the entry under 6 shows, has not been at 60 years of age. The average length of service from ordination to retirement of these thirty-six individuals has been forty-one years, which added to twenty-five, which we have assumed (very liberally) as the average age of ordination, would make out each of these to have retired, from physical incapacity, at 66 years of age. The expectation of life at 60 being thirteen and a half years, it is plain that the pension fund would only be burdened by class 3 from the age of 66, not from the age of 60; and the expectation of life of persons reaching 66 being ten years, the cost of class 3 to the fund would be as ten to thirteen and a half. Turning this proportion into persons instead of cost, we find that the thirty-six retired at 66 would equal 27·66, equal to, say, twenty-seven retired at 60 and claiming pension.

We turn next to class 5, the never beneficed. It might be assumed that every one of these should claim the pension. But here, again, a correction must be made. In seven cases out of these sixteen there is no record whatever of more than two years' Church work having been done in the whole life from ordination. These are presumably men of fortune, who for one cause or another have left the calling altogether. Supposing these to have secured pensions on the plan proposed *while in work*, they would each be able to claim only two pensions of 10*l.* each, so that the united chargeability of these seven on the fund would be only 140*l.*, not so much as two individuals, for whom we will allow them to count. The number, then, to claim under class 5 is reduced by five, from sixteen to eleven.

We come next to the question of resignations stimulated by the right to the pension. We may assume that a right to 100*l.* a year, if unbeneficed, will not be sufficient to induce

the resignation at any earlier time than ordinary (the cases of which we have treated under class 3) of livings worth over 200*l.* a year net with residences.

It may be, and ought to be, different with livings below that value. Their number is 63. We will assume that half of these (say those worth only 100*l.* a year net) will be resigned directly on the incumbent reaching 60 years of age (and this calculation is also a very liberal one, *very few indeed* of these benefices being under 100*l.* a year). Let us say, then, that 31 of these will be immediately resigned. Of the remainder, 32, we can only assume that they will be resigned for the sake of pension when it becomes necessary for the incumbent to pay a curate; that is, they will be resigned from physical incapacity. We will treat these, then, as we have treated class 3, and assume them all to be resigned at the age of 66. The chargeability of their incumbents on the pension fund being reduced, in the proportion already shown, from 27 to 20, we may place their number as 23·7—say 24.

Let us next, having treated these various separate points, apply them to our table, and find out what exact proportion the claimants on the fund will bear to the 406 individuals under observation aged 60 years and over. They will consist of—

Class 1 (31 + 24)	55
3	27
5	11
						<hr/>
						93

This gives a proportion of claimants on the fund to contributors of 93 to 406, almost exactly of 1 to 4 $\frac{1}{3}$; so that, as far as can be judged from our two large inductions of 1,000 each, the pensions proposed to be granted might be safely undertaken at much less than one-fourth part of the ordinary cost of a Post Office pension.

We shall probably excite here a remark in disparagement of the conditions we have put forward for these pensions: namely, that to charge contributors a third of the ordinary Post Office price, while the net cost of each pension would be only one-fourth of it, would be extravagant. We answer this by saying that the net cost would be even less still, and yet that the charge of a third will be reasonable.

For we have shown in a previous part of our article that, while no pension would ever be granted not fully paid up in advance, a great deal of money would accrue to the fund from offertory tithe in parishes (1) where no curates were

emp
had
the
to e
of p
all p
than
shor
teres
why
inter
for i
univ
4*l.* 3
pense
sourc
estim
Post
limit
mone
T
fund
unber
consi
ances
so ze
may l
T
secure
on his
once t
might
alread
tional
provis
Th
should
answer
secure
the fa
rates t
twice a
we hav
means
sum a

employed, (2) where the curate or curates for the time being had already secured ten pensions of 10*l.* each, and (3) where the offertory tithe exceeded the exact sum of 5*l.* to be offered to each curate for insuring. But another considerable source of profit would accrue to the fund. This insurance money, all paid in advance, would fructify at a much higher interest than that estimated in the Post Office tables for comparatively short and precarious insurances. The Post Office rate of interest for deferred annuities is $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. ; there is no reason why the Curates' Augmentation Fund should not secure safe interest at 4 per cent. instead. The Clergy Mutual Society, for instance, as sound an institution probably as exists in the universe, invests its whole funds at an average interest of 4*l.* 3*s.* 10*d.* Therefore, allowing a reasonable margin for expense of management to the Augmentation Fund, the many sources of appreciation we have shown will fully justify us in estimating that even one-fifth, instead of one-third, of the Post Office rate for pensions would suffice for securing the limited pension proposed. Why, then, require nearly twice the money from contributors ?

The answer is, in order to create a larger and growing fund for giving further and additional advantages to the unbeneficed and poorer clergy. We have only in this article considered pensions, leaving quite out of view the life insurances by which so many poor clergy so earnestly desire and so zealously labour to make provision for helpless ones they may have to leave behind them.

Till the poor man's *own* means of existence be made secure by pension, his life insurance for his family, depending on his own existence and earnings, *cannot be secured* ; but, if once the pension be gained, the large increments of the fund might be applied by its managers in giving to the men, already provided with pension, proper and welcome proportional aids in their then more hopeful efforts at making provision for their families.

This may explain why a larger sum than actually required should be asked for the pension insurance ; it does not answer the allegation that it renders the pension difficult to secure by increasing its cost. The answer to this is found in the fact which we have indicated when stating the separate rates to be paid at separate ages, that even though paying twice as much as the actual cost to such an organization as we have described, the purchaser of a pension through the means we have indicated will be receiving for a very small sum a very large money value, otherwise absolutely unob-

tainable, the real value of the 10*l.* pension for which at twenty-four he would pay 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* being 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*, and the real worth of the same pension for which at forty he would pay 5*l.* 13*s.* 3*d.* being 37*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

We commend the study of this important subject to our readers. It seems to offer great advantages to the very classes among our Church workers who most need and deserve them, while putting their winning on the proper basis of self-help and outside justice. A careful study of the matter will, we trust, in due time induce some influential members of the Church of England to move in this matter, on the lines first suggested by the Rev. Prebendary Wood. Once the altogether reasonable proposal made by him of tithing the Sacramental offertories meets, as it must meet, the approval both of bishops and congregations, and a method, such as we have advocated, of investing, securing, and complementing these contributions has been provided, a brighter day will have dawned for the prospects of our less fortunate Church workers and those dependent upon them; while Church members, on the other hand, will, almost unconsciously, and with hardly any greater appreciable exertion than at present, be wiping away the dark reproach now resting upon them of leaving so many worthy men to want and disappointment, either from lack of will to help them or from lack of knowing how.

An

WH

Wha

episc

with

and

unde

Chur

supp

A

bisho

creat

six v

found

by A

the p

1,000

1,250

been

the C

for e

Wels

Asap

Augu

forma

bisho

of H

Bristo

The I

efficie

passed

the c

repeal

additi

creatic

Act s

ART. VIII.—THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE.

*An Act to provide for the foundation of four new bishoprics in
England. 1878.*

WHAT are the most marked deficiencies of our episcopacy? What additions or modifications does our present form of episcopacy require in order to render it more in accordance with the idea of a New Testament and primitive episcopacy, and to enable it to discharge efficiently its spiritual duties under the present necessities and altered condition of the Church? Is it at all probable that the Act of 1878 will supply them?

At the time of the Norman Conquest there were nineteen bishoprics in England and Wales. These had not been created all at once, but gradually. Of these nineteen bishoprics six were founded by the Britons, the other thirteen were founded after the reintroduction of Christianity from Rome by Augustine in the year 596. The usual estimate given of the population of England and Wales at the Conquest is 1,000,000. At its *highest* estimate the population then was 1,250,000. If we suppose the dioceses in England to have been twice as populous as those in Wales at the time of the Conquest, we have at that time an aggregate of 70,000 for each English and 35,000 for each Welsh diocese. The Welsh dioceses were Bangor, Llandaff, S. David's, and S. Asaph, the same as at the present day, all founded before Augustine came in 596. At the commencement of the Reformation the population had increased to 4,000,000. Two bishoprics, Ely and Carlisle, had been added. At the death of Henry VIII. there were twenty-six bishops; Gloucester, Bristol, Oxford, Peterborough, and Chester had been added. The Reformers saw the necessity of a more complete and efficient episcopal supervision. Consequently an Act was passed for the creation of ten more sees immediately after the creation of the five above mentioned. This Act was repealed in the first and second of Philip and Mary. In addition to these Henry VIII. had an Act passed for the creation of twenty-six additional suffragan bishops. This Act stands unrepealed. In Henry VIII.'s time, now three

centuries and a half ago, there were twenty-six bishoprics actually existing, and Acts were passed for the creation and establishment of thirty-six more. In all provision was made by law for sixty-two bishoprics. But the Act for suffragans, though unrepealed, remained a dead letter upon the statute book until 1836, a period of 300 years. In the year 1836 Ripon was created, being transformed from a collegiate to a cathedral church. But Gloucester and Bristol were at the same time united. Since that time five other bishoprics have been created—Manchester, Truro, S. Albans, Liverpool, and Newcastle. These with the ancient bishopric of Sodor and Man raise the number to thirty-two. To this estimate must again be added the four suffragan bishops of Dover, Nottingham, Bedford, and Colchester. In all thirty-six bishops. The population of England and Wales on Sunday, April 4, 1881, was 25,968,286; in round numbers 26,000,000. With this vast increase of population in the course of eight centuries, from 1,250,000 at the highest estimate to 26,000,000, there are only seventeen more bishops, including suffragans, for episcopal administration, than there were 800 years ago. Eight of the dioceses now exceed 1,000,000 in population, and one of them, London, has a population of 2,500,000, twice the entire population of England and Wales united at the time of the Conquest. This condition for a Church professedly episcopal seems a most anomalous one. Nor can this condition be relieved in any way by the plea that travelling is now greatly facilitated. The present times are very different from the times of the Conquest. By the very facility for travelling, and still more by the invention of printing, the diffusion of intelligence among the masses, and the general mental activity of the times, the calls and duties of the episcopate are now more than correspondingly increased.

But the contrast is still more to our disadvantage when we know from authentic records that 'every diocese in olden times, besides its own bishop, had a suffragan bishop, and frequently two or three suffragans at one time. Bishop Longland of Lincoln (1529 A.D.) had three at the same time, and he assigned as a reason for them in his petition to the Pope the great extent of his diocese.'¹ Harmer in his *Specimen of Errors*, quoted by Canon Dixon at the Derby Church Congress, says, 'There seemeth to have been a suffragan bishop in every diocese of England save Carlisle, Rochester, and the Welsh dioceses, and in several more than one.' The

¹ The Rev. Alfred Jones's pamphlet on *Increase of Episcopacy*.

Suffr
to th
of th
S
contr
the s
Proce
size a
coun
470
prese
of o
numb
If
what
inade
day,
most
the c
painf
gathe
from
minis
of th
The
uncor
altoge
memb
ferent
have
of th
They
'Are
in Ch
confir
expres
admit
confir
one ri
admin
these
matur
an im

Suffragan Act itself states, 'Suffragans have been accustomed to be had within this realm for the more speedy administration of the sacraments.'

Such a state of our episcopacy stands in very marked contrast with its condition in the primitive Church. 'From the small province of Proconsular Asia—the post-Diocletian Proconsular Asia is referred to—which was about the same size as Lincolnshire, forty-two bishops were present at an early council. In the only half-converted province of North Africa 470 episcopal towns are now known.'¹ In France of the present day, with a population only about one-third in excess of our own, there are ninety bishops, or three times the number that there are in England.

If the question were asked of the clergy of the Church in what official sphere they find the episcopacy to be especially inadequate to the necessities of the Church at the present day, the reply would almost unanimously be, The want is *most felt* in the administration of confirmation. To most of the clergy the gatherings for a confirmation are their most painful and disappointing ministerial experiences. Such gatherings of candidates from many parishes, and oftentimes from considerable distances, prove most unfitting for the administration of so solemn an ordinance. All the sightseers of the place and neighbourhood gather on such occasions. The herding together of confirmation candidates from many unconnected parishes keeps very many back from confirmation altogether, and thus many who would become and remain members of the Church go to swell the ranks of the indifferent or become Nonconformists. Many of mature years have been kept back from presenting themselves on account of the ordeal which they are called upon to pass through. They are willing to confess Christ before men, but they ask, 'Are we called upon to make our solemn profession of faith in Christ in such indiscriminate gatherings as those in which confirmation is usually administered?' The Church has herself expressly enjoined in her rubric, 'And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.' This one rite alone, to ensure its more frequent and more reverent administration, and to remove the stumbling-blocks which these heterogeneous assemblies cause in the minds of the mature, and more sensitive, and more thoughtful, calls for an immediate and a sufficient extension of the episcopacy.

¹ Hatch's *Bampton Lectures* for 1880, p. 78.

TABLE I.

	1880		1881		Number of Churches
	Number of Confirmations	Number Confirmed	Number of Confirmations	Number Confirmed	
Canterbury . . .	85	5,895	94	6,173	411
York	41	6,890	52	7,396	628
London . . .	106	15,539	111	15,525	469
Durham . . .	44	5,806	38	5,016	386
Winchester . . .	95	7,681	92	7,345	529
Bath and Wells . . .	40	4,830	40	4,070	497
Carlisle . . .	49	4,591	12	1,172	293
Chester . . .	95	15,048	66	7,502	426
Chichester . . .	67	7,155	29	2,585	330
Ely	50	5,398	56	5,133	554
Exeter	102	6,034	101	5,791	499
Gloucester and Bristol .	68	7,003	70	6,327	478
Hereford . . .	43	2,461	50	3,218	410
Lichfield . . .	145	11,492	130	11,517	717
Lincoln . . .	85	6,435	81	5,901	810
Manchester . . .	52	8,708	77	15,183	466
Norwich . . .	40	4,070	46	5,053	914
Oxford	84	6,616	91	7,612	614
Peterborough . . .	44	5,408	48	5,896	570
Ripon	59	8,295	48	7,630	487
Rochester . . .	70	8,780	73	9,143	467
S. Albans . . .	77	5,462	68	7,661	593
Salisbury . . .	78	6,757	75	5,240	478
Truro	48	1,536	38	1,438	233
Worcester . . .	39	5,086	76	8,910	475

Percentage Confirmed
87
71
68
66
59
57
57
57
55
54
54
52
47
47
45
39
38
37
35
35
34
33
32
28
23

TABLE II.

Number of Churches	Percentage Confirmed	Diocese	Population in 1871	Number arriving annually of an age to be Confirmed	Average number Confirmed in the two years 1880 and 1881	Average No. of Confirmations held	One Confirmation in every — of Population	One Confirmation in every — Churches
411	87	Salisbury . .	383,514	6,840	5,998	77	4,980	6
628	71	Oxford . .	552,770	9,990	7,114	88	6,278	7
469	68	Hereford . .	237,138	4,140	2,839	47	5,045	9
386	66	Chichester . .	416,328	7,380	4,870	48	8,673	7
529	59	Canterbury . .	567,091	10,080	6,034	89	6,371	4
497	57	Glo'ster & Bristol	637,028	11,520	6,665	69	9,232	7
293	57	Bath and Wells	430,326	7,740	4,453	40	10,758	12
426	57	Ely . . .	519,286	9,180	5,265	53	9,797	10
330	55	S. Albans . .	660,117	11,880	6,561	73	9,042	8
554	54	Exeter . .	601,374	10,800	5,912	102	5,895	5
499	54	Peterborough . .	532,937	9,540	5,152	46	11,585	12
478	52	Winchester . .	800,000	14,400	7,513	94	8,510	5
410	47	Carlisle . .	334,786	6,012	2,881	32	10,462	9
717	47	Lichfield . .	1,356,869	24,300	11,504	138	9,832	5
810	45	Lincoln . .	757,491	13,500	6,168	83	9,126	9
466	39	Worcester . .	980,982	17,640	6,998	58	16,913	8
914	38	Norwich . .	668,123	12,000	4,511	43	15,537	21
614	37	York . .	1,060,000	19,080	7,143	47	22,553	11
570	35	Chester . .	1,762,201	31,680	11,275	81	21,755	5
487	35	Manchester . .	1,893,542	34,020	11,945	65	29,131	7
467	34	London . .	2,539,000	45,540	15,532	109	23,293	4
593	33	Rochester . .	1,500,000	27,000	8,961	72	20,833	6
478	32	Ripon . .	1,357,000	24,300	7,962	54	25,129	9
233	28	Durham . .	1,077,569	19,180	5,411	41	26,000	9
475	23	Truro . .	362,343	6,480	1,487	43	8,428	5

The Archdeacon of Lindisfarne at a recent Durham Conference well expressed the present need. 'With regard to confirmations,' he said, 'the increased and increasing demands for the more frequent administration of this most important rite will not be satisfied with less than *annual, parochial, and personal* confirmations.'

In the Registrar-General's Report issued from Somerset House in January 1860 the following is given as the estimated numbers of the different ages, as taken from the census of 1851, when the population of England and Wales was returned as 20,959,457 :—

'Estimated numbers living in England and Wales in the middle of 1851 at the ages herein stated—

Ages .	14	15	16	17	18
Persons .	375,610	371,583	366,821	361,940	357,095

Somerset House :
Jan. 31, 1860.

GEORGE GRAHAM,
Registrar-General.'

If the population in England and Wales in 1851, 20,959,457, is divided by 371,583, the number at the age of 15 years, the age usually accepted by the bishops for confirmation, it gives one of 15 years of age in every 56 of the population, or 2 in every 112, or 180 in every 10,000 of the population. If this is used as a basis of calculation, and the number of confirmed in each diocese is tabulated, then a very accurate estimate may be drawn of the work which each diocese is doing in this matter among its population.

In Table I. we give the returns of the numbers confirmed in the years 1880 and 1881 in every diocese of England, together with the number of confirmations held in each diocese in each year and the number of churches in each diocese.

We have omitted the four Welsh dioceses, Bangor, Llandaff, S. Asaph, and S. David's. The number of confirmations held and the number of confirmed persons in the diocese of Liverpool during part of 1881 are added to those of Chester for that year, to prevent confusion.

In Table II. the results drawn from the preceding Table are given. The dioceses in this second Table are arranged according to the percentage in each of the confirmed persons. The percentage is calculated on the average of the confirmed in the two years combined of 1880 and 1881, in comparison with the number who arrived in those years at an age to be confirmed.

There are certain facts which are prominently brought out in the second Table. It is noticeable that not one of the

diocese
centa
year
rule,
only
to be
has
Wesle
has
must
tion t
Truro
the s
the pe
except
tion.
confir
notice
fore t
percen
only :
very m
of the
agricul
the la
confir
tion in
5,000
twelve
tion.
the dic
Glo
diocese
Bath a
This re
by the
the for
Lic
raised
several
more f
plying
tions.
higher
increase

dioceses whose population exceeds a million rises to a percentage confirmed of fifty per cent. on those who arrive each year at the age for confirmation. *The largest dioceses, as a rule, present the lowest percentage in those confirmed.* Truro is only a seeming exception to this rule. That diocese is known to be exceptional in its religious character. The diocese itself has only been recently constituted, and the influence of Wesleyanism has in Cornwall been almost paramount. It has consequently been called the Paradise of revivalists. It must therefore be regarded as in no way forming an exception to the above statement. As a factor in our calculation Truro is therefore throughout omitted. On the other hand *the smaller the population of a diocese the larger, as a rule, is the percentage of the confirmed.* To this there are only a few exceptions. The cause of these exceptions is easy of explanation. They are to be accounted for by the small number of confirmations held in those exceptional dioceses. It is also noticeable that the number of confirmations held, and therefore the number of centres of confirmation, influences the percentage throughout the dioceses. To give a few instances only: the dioceses of Salisbury and Bath and Wells do not very materially differ in population, nor in the characteristics of their respective dioceses. They are both almost purely agricultural. The former diocese has a population of 383,000, the latter one of 430,000. The former has seventy-seven confirmations, the latter only forty. Salisbury has a confirmation in one in every six of its churches, and one in every 5,000 of its population; Bath and Wells only one in every twelve of its churches, and one in every 10,000 of its population. The result is that 30 per cent. more are confirmed in the diocese of Salisbury than in that of Bath and Wells.

Gloucester and Bristol and Bath and Wells are contiguous dioceses. The former, with a population 200,000 in excess of Bath and Wells, has the same percentage as that diocese. This result is obtained, in spite of its much larger population, by the former bishop holding sixty-nine confirmations against the forty of Bath and Wells.

Lichfield also, though one of the larger dioceses, has raised its percentage above all of its own size and above several of a much smaller population, and populations far more favourable to the Church, by especial efforts in multiplying the numbers, and so the centres, of its annual confirmations. With its much larger population it is yet 10 per cent. higher than York. This fact is solely attributable to the increased number of confirmations. On the other hand the

very low position of Norwich may be attributed to the fewness of its confirmations. It has an exceedingly low percentage for a purely agricultural diocese; a diocese which is free from the large, overgrown, unmanageable parishes, and from the migratory parishioners, of colliery districts. The fact of there being only one confirmation annually in every twenty-one of the churches of that diocese, and in every 15,000 of its population, and that in a diocese where the 15,000 must be spread over a very considerable area, sufficiently accounts for its holding the lowest position among the purely agricultural dioceses.

Salisbury, which heads all the dioceses by 16 per cent., has also the greatest number of confirmations in proportion to its population. This cause influences the position of almost all the dioceses. Exeter is the only diocese that to any extent seems to contradict this position. The much lower position of this diocese than might have been expected from the great diligence of its bishop in holding confirmations is no doubt attributable to the same cause which, as explained above, gives so low a position to the neighbouring diocese of Truro. Even the present position which Exeter holds results from its standing third in the number of annual confirmations. We can imagine how low its percentage would have been if it had had, like Norwich, only one confirmation in every twenty-one of its churches and one in every 15,000 of its population, or even had it been, like York, one confirmation in every 22,500 of its population and one in every eleven of its churches.

But the influence of multiplied centres can be further illustrated by the following tabulation of seven of the chief agricultural dioceses. It will be seen from it that they take their position as to their percentage of confirmed persons *in an inverse ratio to the area which is embraced in each confirmation. The larger the area the lower the percentage; the smaller the area—the more parochial, in fact, the confirmations are made—the higher as a rule is the diocese upon the list.* Dioceses like Carlisle, which have extensive ranges of moorland, are not included in the table. In the case of Salisbury and Oxford in the following table, where there seems a reversion of the order we might expect, as Salisbury precedes Oxford though covering a larger area at each confirmation, we see that this is explained by Table II., where Salisbury is shown to hold a confirmation in every 4,980 of its population, and Oxford only one in every 6,278.

T
dioc
paris
miles
coun
very
the c
V
come
confi
Ther
high
lacion
Brist
man
lacion
stage
only
instea
T
tions
from
six d
the si
are n
T
dioces
are ei
increa
entire
beyon
embra
VOL

TABLE III.

Percentage	Diocese	One Confirmation in every — Square Miles
87	Salisbury	26
71	Oxford	24
68	Hereford	32
57	Bath and Wells	40
54	Peterborough	42
45	Lincoln	43
38	Norwich	72

The enormous area covered by each confirmation in the diocese of Norwich may be judged of by the following comparison. The little county of Rutland contains 150 square miles. If a line were drawn north and south cutting the county into two equal divisions, each division would give a very correct representation of each confirmation district in the diocese of Norwich.

What a change as to the number of the confirmed would come over the diocese of Norwich if the same number of confirmations were held in it as in Exeter or as in Lichfield. There is no internal reason why Norwich should not hold as high a position as Gloucester and Bristol at least. The population of the two dioceses is the same. Yet Gloucester and Bristol confirms 57 per cent., Norwich only 38. And in like manner there is no internal reason why York, with a population of 300,000 less than Lichfield, should not be as many stages above Lichfield as Lichfield is now above York, if only York had, like Lichfield, its 138 confirmations annually instead of its 47.

The influence of population and the number of confirmations in proportion thereto may be also strikingly illustrated from the following tabulation. In Table IV. (p. 162) the six dioceses at the head of the percentage in Table II. and the six lowest in it are massed in two classes, and the results are notified below the table.

The percentage given of those confirmed in the *larger* dioceses is in excess of the reality. These larger dioceses are either manufacturing or suburban. They have all largely increased in population between 1871 and 1880-1. The entire increase in England as given in the census of 1881 beyond that of 1871 is 3,000,000. Yorkshire alone, which is embraced by the dioceses of York and Ripon, has increased

440,000. In consequence the percentage given for these and similar dioceses is far too favourable. This refers more or less to all the dioceses which exceed a million in population.

TABLE IV.

Percentage	Diocese	Population, 1871	Number of Confirmations held	One Confirmation in every
Class A	Salisbury	383,514	77	4,980
	Oxford	552,770	88	6,278
	Hereford	237,138	47	5,045
	Chichester	416,328	48	8,670
	Canterbury	567,091	89	6,371
	Gloucester and Bristol	637,028	69	9,232
Class B	Chester	1,762,201	81	21,755
	Manchester	1,893,542	65	29,131
	London	2,539,000	109	23,293
	Rochester	1,500,000	72	20,833
	Ripon	1,357,000	54	25,129
	Durham	1,077,569	41	26,000

In A 418 confirmations are held in a population of 2,791,869.

In B 422 confirmations are held in a population of 10,129,312.

In A one confirmation in every 6,683 persons.

In B one confirmation in every 24,000 persons.

Consequently in Class A 68 per cent. are confirmed.

Consequently in Class B 33 per cent. are confirmed.

But the very favourable influence of smaller dioceses and increased numbers of confirmations on the work of the Church may be very remarkably instanced from the two dioceses which have now been divided for a few years, and so afford a means of comparison before and after the division. The two dioceses are Rochester and Exeter.

In Rochester before Division	No. of Confirmations	No. Confirmed
1874	60	6,029
1875	93	9,220
1876	82	7,406
	235	22,655

The dioceses were officially separated on May 4, 1877.

these
more
popu-

arma-
very

o
8
5
o
1
2

5
1
3
3
9
o

Since Division	No. of Confir- mations	No. Confirmed
Rochester 1879 .	64	7,244
" 1880 .	70	8,780
" 1881 .	65	9,406
	199	25,430
S. Albans 1879 .	62	5,999
" 1880 .	62	5,462
" 1881 .	63	7,562
	187	19,023

Before division 22,655
Since " 44,463

The confirmed are exactly doubled.
The same may be illustrated from Exeter.

	No. of Confir- mations	No. Confirmed
Before Division		
Exeter 1875 .	124	5,401
" 1876 . .	124	6,274 = 11,675
After Division		
Exeter 1879 .	106	5,898
" 1880 . .	102	6,034 = 11,932
Truro 1879 .	45	1,741
" 1880 . .	48	1,536 = 3,277

and
church
cesses
ord a
e two

Exeter advances in number, and there is added the clear gain of Truro. Another feature is also noticeable: that greater results are attained in a smaller area even with fewer confirmations than in a more extended area with more confirmations. In Rochester as divided there are, as above, 25,430 confirmed with 199 confirmations, against 22,655 with 235 confirmations under its old more extended area. The same is noticeable in the case of Exeter. Before division 11,675 were confirmed, with 248 confirmations; after division 11,932 were confirmed, with 208 confirmations. The results, we feel sure, would have been still more striking, if the numbers of confirmations held in Rochester and Exeter after division had been equal to those before it.

All the preceding percentages are calculated in reference only to those who each year arrive at the age of fifteen; but in addition to those who are each year arriving at that age there remains a vast residuum to be gathered up from those

who are past fifteen years of age, and who during all the past years have never been confirmed.

The above statistics show a very serious deficiency in the work of the Church.¹ The question necessarily arises, To what cause can this deficiency be attributed? Though there are many causes which doubtless contribute to this result yet it is felt almost universally that *one of the chief causes lies in defective administration of the rite of confirmation.* Unless a very great change is made in this respect no great improvement can be anticipated.

In order to estimate the position aright take an analogous case. Imagine the effect if we had in the Church wholesale baptisms and wholesale administrations of the Holy Communion annually or triennially. The numbers of the baptized and of the communicants would in every parish be immediately startlingly reduced. Much more would they decline if at these annual or triennial administrations the candidates had to travel several miles to receive baptism or Communion. Infinitely greater still would be the reduction if, in addition to this, these administrations were held solely upon a week day.

If the Church were efficiently supplied with bishops we feel sure that Sunday confirmations would soon become the rule. The week-day confirmations would be the exceptions. It would be as exceptional to hold a confirmation service on the week day as it is now, at least in country parishes, to hold a baptismal service on a week day. At least ninety per cent. of our people are baptized on a Sunday. Sunday is the special day set apart for all other religious ordinances. Sunday is at least pre-eminently the working man's day of possible leisure for such services. In the manufacturing and mining districts, where the number of confirmed persons is fewest, mill hands, whether young men or women, and young men engaged in collieries, are often distinctly refused permission by their overlookers to absent themselves from their work on such occasions. The absence of a few either at a mill or a colliery, or wherever the work is carried on in companies, disorganizes the work at the mill or pit. In fact the

¹ In the above lists the candidates are supposed to be of all ages from fifteen years and upwards. The Bishop of Lichfield, in his recently issued pastoral letter (1883), looking at the results of the confirmations in his diocese, says: 'The numbers, moreover, were greatly swollen by adults, which made even more striking the deficiency as regards the young. It was evident that they were lost by hundreds, and even by thousands, who either drifted into the ranks of dissent, or went to swell the awful multitude living without God or hope in the world.'

masters
throw o
for the
one mu
with a
or ove
confir
great g
present
and af
also b
from t
no suc
day ho
but th
gone t
what p
no ord
proves
confir
scoffers

Even
from a
to prot
begin s
mation
proven
male a
reduced
Of thes
the pro

With
in deta
radius
Sunday
would
soon b
people.
many c
Sunday

¹ Accord
confirm
England
6 to 9.
males an

masters, if written to, will frequently reply that they cannot throw other hands out of employment and stop the machinery for the accommodation of a few. This power of refusal, which one must admit has its reasonable side, is sometimes exercised with a harsh severity by an irreligious or partisan principal or overlooker. Under the present difficulties of week-day confirmations even *evening* confirmations would be a very great gain. They would enable many to attend who at the present time are debarred from confirmation in the morning and afternoon. A very scathing and severe ordeal would also be saved the younger candidates, such as mill-hands from the factories and colliery lads from the pit, if they had no such ordeal to pass through as to appear during the work-day hours of a week day at confirmation. Few are aware but those who have heard it from the candidates who have gone through it what taunts and gibes are cast at them and what persecution they have to endure. Indeed, it requires no ordinary courage to face it. With very many the trial proves too great, and those who would otherwise have been confirmed are led astray and unite themselves with the scoffers.

Evening confirmations would free numbers of candidates from a persecution against which the Church should endeavour to protect her members. Only let a bishop in such a diocese begin such a system of administration, and the roll of confirmation candidates would in a few years show a marked improvement. The disproportion also between the numbers of male and female candidates would, we feel sure, be greatly reduced. In the confirmations of 1880 170,000 were confirmed. Of these 69,000 were males, and 101,000 females; that is, in the proportion of seven males to ten females.¹

Without discussing the question of Sunday confirmation in detail we are unable to see why every parish within a radius of twelve miles from the palace should not have its Sunday confirmation. Such annual services in parish churches would form a most wholesome change. The bishop would soon become personally known to a portion at least of his people. His annual visit would be looked forward to, and in many cases eagerly anticipated, until in time the 'Bishop's Sunday' might become a loving household word in every

¹ According to the *Official Year-Book* (p. 600), the total number of confirmed persons (not including Exeter and Llandaff) for ten years in England and Wales was 584,731 males, 886,987 females; that is, about 6 to 9. This shows on the ten years a very similar proportion between males and females to the results at which we had independently arrived.

home of the parish, and thus the old pastoral ideal of the father of his people might be realized by any bishop who would value so simple and primitive a title. Such confirmations would be strictly parochial. A few words earnestly spoken to the young on such occasions in the quiet of their own church, while they are surrounded by their parents and friends, would leave an impression never to be forgotten. It would reach also the older members of the congregation. Such an annual visit of the bishop to his people, even in a radius of twelve miles from the palace, would have a real and living influence. The Church might then hope that her annals would tell the pleasant story of many a Bishop Wilson, whose personal and kindly pastorate had been exercised in her smaller dioceses. One cannot help noticing in this connection how small¹ was the diocese over which the Bishop of Sodor and Man obtained that strong, firm, beneficent, and personal influence which has made his name so venerated in our Church.

The large numbers presented at a confirmation also act most injuriously on the devotional spirit of the congregation. Over 500 candidates are in many instances presented at a time. Even the average at each confirmation of Manchester is 184; this is the highest diocesan average. If the average of the diocese of Manchester is so high, what must the number at some of its confirmations reach? The archdiocese of York is the next highest average; its average is 151. Large numbers of candidates must surely tend to extinguish a quiet devotional spirit. How can the 'prayers of the Church' be a reality if the administration is reduced to a wearisome and formal repetition?

If every parish were permitted to have a Sunday confirmation annually the rite of confirmation would be brought home with great force. Parishioners who had in former years brought their children to be baptized at the font would witness the sealing of the baptized by confirmation in the same church. The two rites would soon be very closely associated in the minds of the people. The one would be considered incomplete without the other. The administration of the two rites in the same church would appeal strongly to those parents whose happiest and earliest religious associations were, according to the ideal of the Church of England, connected with their own parish church. It would, in the course of a generation, be-

¹ The present population of Sodor and Man is 51,000, the benefices number 31, and the area is 226 square miles. The area of the diocese is only one-fourth larger than Rutlandshire.

come as unusual to omit the confirmation of their children as it is now unusual to omit their baptism.

We must decline to agree with the Bishop of Rochester, who in a recent charge has sought a remedy for existing evils by discouraging the parochial feeling. The Bishop somewhat humorously observes, 'Our numbers of confirmed persons for this year (1881) are already 8,022; they will be 9,000 before the end of the year. But our numbers should be 18,000, a total which for one person's physical strength might be a severe though exhilarating trial.' His Lordship must pardon us for adding the correction that 27,000, not 18,000, ought to present themselves for confirmation, if the entire population arriving at the age of fifteen years in the diocese annually is reckoned. To relieve this strain the Bishop asks his clergy 'to discountenance the growing habit of deferring confirmation till they receive it at their own church. Many slip,' says the Bishop, 'through the delay, who otherwise would have attained it. It is not quite fair upon the bishop.' Whilst heartily agreeing that any enforced 'exhilaration' would be scarcely fair upon his Lordship, might we not ask, Is not 'fairness' also to be considered in reference to those who are the other parties to the rite?

But in addition to this one branch of episcopal duties there are many other reasons which necessitate an increase of the episcopacy if the Church of England is in any way to fulfil her mission as an episcopal Church. There is need of a much closer and more intimate relation and acquaintance between the bishop and the clergy as well as the people of his diocese. We all know that bishops with their work half done are yet greatly overtaxed. The late Bishop (Selwyn) of Lichfield had two assistant-bishops, and yet the Bishop of Lincoln writes of him 'that nevertheless he sank beneath the weight of the pressure of his enormous diocese. He fell a martyr to his episcopal office.'¹

Not only are the dioceses enormous, but the duties of the episcopacy are so multifarious that the episcopacy, as far as its *spiritual* power goes, is almost unfelt by the clergy and the people. Our Church claims to be an episcopal Church. We should use every means to make the episcopacy a reality, a real, personal, spiritual power and influence 'known and read of all men.' It is no singular experience for a clergyman to be in the diocese of a bishop twenty or thirty years,

¹ During the last five years of Bishop Selwyn's episcopate (1873-77), the average number annually of confirmations held in his diocese was 212; the highest reaching 219, the lowest 204.

and his only acquaintance with his diocesan has probably been a semi-public interview at a confirmation, or at the consecration of a church or churchyard. As the ideal parish clergyman is to his people so ought the ideal bishop to be to his clergy, a real father in Christ. Ought we in this nineteenth century wholly to lose sight of the New Testament ideal of the relation of a bishop and his clergy pourtrayed in the loving picture of the relations between Paul and Timothy? We do not imply by this question that such real and sympathizing relations have entirely ceased to exist, but only that, owing to the great extent of the dioceses, it is impossible that such a relation should *generally* prevail.

It might be asked, To what numbers in population should a diocese be limited? We think that most of the clergy would reply that a diocese *in no case* ought to exceed a population of 250,000, unless when massed in a single town.

It seems to us that a population of 250,000 souls is large enough, even when the population is only moderately spread, if the episcopate is to be really effective. Where the population is spread over a large area, as in York, Lincoln, and Oxford, or similar dioceses, even a quarter of a million seems excessive. Only half the year is available for general confirmation. With a population of 250,000 there would be annually arriving at confirmation age 4,500. If only 3,000 represented the population belonging to the Church it would give 120 as the number to be confirmed each week. If the residuum of past years were added to this it would give at least 180 a week. This number, if the bishop were to visit all his churches annually, so as to make his confirmations *personal* and *parochial*, would be as many as a bishop, confining himself to evening and Sunday confirmations, would be able, taking into consideration his other duties, weekly to confirm.

In reference to any extension of the episcopate the difficult question of funds immediately arises. This difficulty of course only arises on the supposition that the episcopate must be extended on the lines of our present mediæval system. It would be well if all these conditions could be utterly set aside, at least in all schemes touching upon the extension of the episcopate. The New Testament commission of Christ would then more prominently occupy our thoughts. Thousands of good Church people are so blindly prejudiced in favour of our present system that they imagine that a bishop could not befittingly exercise his spiritual office unless he were a peer of Parliament, or that the spiritual office of a bishop could not be fulfilled on less

than 3
faithful
S. Tho
was cal
Pope I
being c
Pope w
is passe
'Yes, I
also pa
thy beco

It h
that th
of wea
livings
of the
plication
bishops
capital
The fo
Wakefi
diligent
two dio
namely
sion of
still rem
any me
These
unless
the enc
out of t
in the l
of an ap
interest
an imm

Unde
endeave
present
nor the
for the
equally
apostol
publish
be as p
the peo

than 3,000*l.* or 4,000*l.* a year. The conception of these faithful souls reminds us of the anecdote which is told us of S. Thomas of Aquinum, the 'Angel of the Schools,' as he was called. Aquinas was one day sitting in the Vatican with Pope Innocent IV. when masses of gold and silver were being carried into the Papal treasury. 'You see,' said the Pope with a touch of self-satisfaction, 'the age of the Church is passed when she could say, "Silver and gold have I none."' 'Yes, Holy Father,' replied the Angelic Doctor, 'the day is also passed when she could say to the paralytic, "Take up thy bed and walk."'

It has been abundantly manifested in the last five years that the extension of the episcopate by means of the creation of wealthy bishoprics, in contrast to the miserably poor livings of the clergy, does not meet with the hearty sympathy of the laity. The Act of 1878 was very limited in its application. It applied only to the creation of four new bishoprics. These new sees were made conditional on a capital sum of at least 90,000*l.* being actually subscribed. The four proposed bishoprics were Liverpool, Newcastle, Wakefield, and Southwell. Yet after more than five years' diligent canvassing this sum has only been raised for the first two dioceses mentioned. The subscriptions for one of these—namely, Newcastle—were largely supplemented by the diversion of endowment from the mother see of Durham. There still remain difficulties—we do not say insurmountable ones by any means—in raising the required sum for the other two. These difficulties will, however, we fear, continue too long, unless wealthy individuals contribute, as Lady Rolle did in the endowment of the Cornish bishopric, the larger portion out of their own private beneficence from some special interest in the locality. The sum required does not commend itself as of an apostolic pattern, and is far too exorbitant to enlist the interest of the general public, and so has failed to meet with an immediate and cordial response.

Under these circumstances it would be a fatal error to endeavour to perpetuate the creation of bishoprics on our present lines. Neither the position as peers of the realm nor the income of the present bishops is a necessary standard for the creation of new bishoprics, which may possibly be equally efficient as a *spiritual* power on a more primitive and apostolic basis. Dean Hook, in a letter given in his recently published *Life*, says, 'I do not see why our bishops should not be as poor as Ambrose and Augustine, that they may make the people really rich.' Bishop Jolly wrote before his death

to the Bishop of Moray, 'Our episcopacy (the Scotch) is perfectly the same as that of England, but happily (shall I say) divested of all temporal honours.' The late Bishop of Brechin, writing of the personal influence of Bishop Jolly, says, 'The life and teaching and work of that man, quiet, hidden, and humble as it was, is producing great results. Instead of four bishops we have now seven in Scotland, and the feeling of the people towards the Church is undergoing a great change.'

In contrast to the Restrictive Act of 1878 there exists the system of free development of new parishes, as enacted by the Peel and Blandford Acts. By the former of these Acts, passed in 1843, a district could be formed when an endowment was provided for the minister of the annual value of 100*l.*: and if less than 150*l.* it was to be raised to the latter value upon the district becoming a new parish. When the above endowment was provided the new district was constituted. The endowment did not, at the utmost, represent more than a capital sum of 4,000*l.* The necessity even of this small endowment being provided was set aside by Lord Blandford's Act in 1846. The third section of that Act gives the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the discretion of forming a new district, without having the aforesaid endowment absolutely provided beforehand, 'if there is reason to expect from other sources an adequate maintenance for the incumbent.'

No one could doubt that the income of the inferior clergy provided by the Commissioners is sufficiently apostolic in its sparseness. An income of 150*l.* a year, and that not in every case previously guaranteed, is considered an 'adequate maintenance' for a clergyman and his family! Perhaps even the most ardent enthusiast for an *episcopate* extended also on simple and apostolic lines could scarcely wish for an Act for the extension of the episcopacy equally merciless in its economy. Yet provision might be made for the 'adequate maintenance' of the new bishops, which would be sumptuous indeed, even at a minimum of, say, 750*l.* or 800*l.* per annum, compared with the minimum of 150*l.* per annum which the Commissioners have judged an 'adequate maintenance' for the *συμπρεσβύτεροι* of the clergy.

By the Peel and Blandford Acts a free development of parishes was established to meet the spiritual needs of the people, whatever may be said of their adequacy to meet the temporal needs of the clergy. During the last seventy-five years 3,399 entirely new district churches have been built, and of these about 2,600 in the last thirty-six years under the

operation of these Acts. An episcopal Church necessarily requires for its efficiency a corresponding freedom in the multiplication of bishops.¹

Some of the greatest evils in the Church have resulted from the violent contrast existing between the position and incomes of the bishops and the clergy of the Church. It has isolated the bishops and removed them from the clergy. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, quoted by Sir William Worsley at the York Conference (1880), speaks of the the *solitariness* and *isolation* of bishops.

'The primitive view of the strength of bishops,' he says, 'was not solitariness; but we, whether the causes are social, or whether it is due to some unconscious imitation, have been reproducing in our episcopate nearly that isolation which Rome has effected for her bishops, with the deliberate aim in her case that she obliged them to turn to the Vatican for support.'

A gulf such as that which exists between the bishops and the clergy should not exist in any Church of Christ. Such a disproportion exists in no secular avocation, whether official or professional. It is not found in the different ranks of either of army or navy. In the law it is often at a great sacrifice of income that the leading barrister accepts his promotion to the judgeship. This is the case in all secular official life and in all Government offices. In the American Episcopal Church the income of an able and eminent clergyman in the larger towns, as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, often very considerably exceeds the income given to the bishops.

This gulf between the bishops and clergy has in later years been tending to widen rather than to diminish. The incomes of very many of the larger livings of the inferior clergy have been divided. In some cases, as in the noble instance of Dean Hook at Leeds, the income of the incum-

¹ We conceive that a very grave and fundamental error was committed by the committee of the Additional Home Bishoprics Endowment Fund when they came to the decision as expressed in their report. In fact this decision produced the Act of 1878.

'In approaching the subject submitted to them your committee had first to consider whether they ought to face an increase of an extensive character, involving a notable alteration in the existing and long-recognized status of the English episcopate, or only a moderate addition of bishops in parts of the country where the sees were, by reason of area or of the growth of the population, manifestly too few for the actual condition of the Church, the new bishops being, as far as possible, to be placed on the same footing as the existing bishops. The committee unanimously resolved to approach the question from the latter point of view.' (*Official Year-Book*, p. 304.)

bent has been at his own suggestion divided, in order to carry out the work of the Church more efficiently. Old parish churches have also in many instances lost much of their income by the necessary diversion of fees to the new district churches. Together with these changes other causes are now operating extensively in bringing about the same result. At the diocesan conference held in Ely (July 1881) the Bishop of Ely said—

‘The incomes of the clergy of this diocese are almost exclusively associated with land. I regret to say that benefices have been vacated from the impossibility of continuing to hold them, and are still without incumbents, because there is little or no income accruing from them, the glebe being unlet and lying perfectly unproductive.’

The same complaint is heard from every agricultural diocese.

The same severance exists between bishop and people. The two are never brought into contact except on some special occasion. The episcopacy has no hold whatever upon the masses. Let us not be deceived by a casual ‘ovation’ on any great occasion, as at a Working Men’s Meeting at our Church Congresses, or as at some factory address during a special mission. The bishops are unknown to the working men in the large manufacturing towns. ‘It does not do,’ as Dr. Arnold said fifty years ago, ‘to speak to our operatives in these days about our pure and apostolical Church.’ The power of the Church would be infinitely extended and established if the bishops were not so far removed from contact with the mass of the population. The bishops have been compelled, from sheer necessity, to abandon to others, except on very special occasions, the work of making known Christ’s message to the indifferent, the outcast, and the depraved. There is needed, if the episcopacy remain as it is, some connecting link between the bishop and the people. If such a link is not found we cannot expect that a democracy towards which, by household suffrage and other imminent changes, we are more and more tending will care to preserve a form of episcopacy of which it knows nothing, and between which and itself there are no cords of sympathy. During the last fifteen years nothing has been more remarkable than the violent changes of popular opinion. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone came into power with an overwhelming majority. In 1874 he was thrown out with an equally overwhelming adverse vote. In 1880 a still more astonishing majority again returned Mr. Gladstone to power. So great and widespread was the change that the Duke of Argyll, in

his s
men
mos
take
oscil
conv
men
‘tha
Libe
hoo
com
desc
of a
secu
of th
relat
of di
the
meet
face,
requ
have
T
ditio
nova
cases
forei
secul
the
accu
utter
of th
lecti
not t
T
clerg
ing t
meet
to th
the c
three
anoth
one s
bisho
stow

his speech against the Irish Land Bill, said that the Government was lately installed in power by one of the greatest and most violent revolutions of public opinion which has ever taken place in the political history of the country. Such oscillations can scarcely be considered as the result of settled convictions. They have been attributed merely to a momentary superiority in organization, and it has been asserted 'that they have nothing to do with what is Conservative or Liberal, much less with what is right or wrong, truth or falsehood.' With these changes of popular opinion there is also combined another feature of the present age, which has been described by the late Dr. Norman Macleod 'as a jealousy of all monopolies, of all institutions, of all privileges, which secure good to the few at the expense, directly or indirectly, of the many.' No thoughtful person can regard the present relation of the episcopate to the people without some feeling of dismay, especially if there is no effectual attempt made by the Church on her part by reformation and adaptation to meet it. Grave and important questions will rise to the surface, as they have risen lately, on the instant, and it will only require some master mind in the State to say 'that they have now come within the range of practical politics.'

This episcopal position and isolation has led to a condition which is fraught with danger to the Church, the *μοναρχία* of the episcopacy, which unfortunately in many cases strangles her development. Such a principle was foreign to the primitive episcopacy. Our bishops, from their secular position, have been able to initiate all laws affecting the Church. Power has consequently for centuries been accumulating in their hands. The priesthood and laity are utterly powerless in any administration of the general affairs of the Church. The bishops alone, and not the Church collectively, are the sole depositaries of power. They too, and not the Church, are the sole founts of honour.

This *μοναρχία* extends to the smallest concerns. The clergy in their assemblies have not even the privilege of electing their own chairman. The chairman of the rural deanery meetings is appointed by the bishop. The only exceptions to this are the dioceses of Exeter and Cornwall: in which the clergy elect their own rural dean, and elect him only for three years. At the end of that time he can be elected for another term. The present Bishop of Lichfield has taken one step in advance in the exercise of the patronage in the bishop's gift. He has associated with himself for the bestowal of his patronage the capitular body of his cathedral.

This, though not likely to be ultimately satisfactory, is yet a hopeful beginning. We should hope that it may ultimately pass to devolving all patronage, as of old, on the representatives of the Church, of the clergy and laity and bishop combined.

The same spirit has likewise retarded the creation of representative assemblies of the Church. The influence of the clergy does not sensibly extend beyond the boundaries of their own parishes. The Church consists of parochial units. The Lower House of Convocation has remained for three centuries unreformed, whilst the counterpart in the secular division of the State—the House of Commons—has been reformed continually to meet the ever-varying necessities of the time. It does not require a prophet to foretell the end. Stagnation in such a state is only another name for destruction. The Lower House of Convocation can scarcely be considered more than a repetition of the Upper House, so entirely does the episcopal nominee element prevail. Self-government, the very instinct of the Anglo-Saxon race, has been lost to the Church. An embodied expression of the voice of the English Church, of the laity and clergy combined, is unknown. Dissenters can express their opinions through organizations embodied in connexion with their opinions. The Congregationalists have their Union. The Wesleyans in their various branches have their Conferences. Through these central organizations their opinions have great weight on all religious questions brought before Parliament. Only very recently diocesan conferences have been called into existence. The bishops, with a few most honourable exceptions, have manifested a lamentable backwardness in allowing these conferences to be purely representative. The conferences are in the majority of cases destroyed as representative assemblies by the preponderance of episcopal nominees. In them an anomaly, rare in any English institution, is presented of life members and elected members sitting side by side, the former independent of public opinion, the latter subject to rejection triennially if they contravene it. Salisbury, Oxford, S. Albans, and the most recently constituted conference of the London diocese, are however almost free from nominees. In these four conferences only the archdeacons among the clerical members sit *ex officio*. Rochester adds the canons residentiary: but for what purpose this addition is made it is impossible to divine. In the Hereford Conference there are forty-three *ex officio* clerical nominees to forty-seven elected representatives. In that of S. David's diocese they

are e
shoul
officio
the d
and n
great
nomin
selves
made
The
fill an
They
and n
into t
were
injurio
preven
Counc
known
in such
being
the sta
memb
to the
versal,
qualifi
Counci
vocation
equally

'W
the gen
authorit
is perfe

¹ To
sentative
Council
diocesan
clergy.
Canterbu
Gloucester
and Truro
(Rev. J.
Ripon (G
out of t
tween th
the conf
mind of

are equally divided. The dean, in addition to the bishop, should alone of the clerical members of a diocese sit *ex officio*. He is appointed independently of the bishop to the diocese. He is at the head of the cathedral chapter, and might well act as vice-chairman of the conference. The great disadvantage of the introduction of the episcopal nominee element is felt in the diocesan conferences themselves, from its preventing the real mind of the diocese being made known. It prevents all effectual progress in a diocese. The nominees, as being permanent officials in it, naturally fill and form the standing committees of the conference. They are always at hand. They reappear from year to year, and newly elected men who would bring fresh life and energy into the work are excluded. If the evil stayed here, and were merely diocesan, the consequences would not be so injurious. But unhappily these nominees will most effectually prevent the formation of a distinctly representative Central Council, and so prevent the mind of the Church being made known to the country.¹ This great evil can only be obviated in such a case—*i.e.* if these nominees are to continue—by its being not only understood, but also by its being made one of the standing bye-laws of every conference, that no unelected member of a diocesan conference shall be eligible for election to the Central Council. If such a bye-law is not made universal, or is not made by the Central Council as a necessary qualification to association and election to it, the Central Council will only become a modified Lower House of Convocation, equally unrepresentative, equally unprogressive, and equally impotent.

‘Whenever the Church is bold enough to devise means by which the general voice of Churchmen, laity as well as clergy, can speak authoritatively, Parliament will listen to it. That such an assembly is perfectly compatible with Establishment the example of the

¹ To the present Central Council twenty-three dioceses send representatives. Out of sixty-nine clerical members sent to the Central Council only twenty-two are elected by the clergy to their respective diocesan conferences. In fact not one-third are the representatives of the clergy. The following twelve dioceses send all officials, nominees: Canterbury, Winchester, Bath and Wells, Carlisle, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, Manchester, Oxford, Peterborough, S. David's, and Truro. The following five send one elected member each: Hereford (Rev. J. Mitchell), Lichfield (Rev. F. Atkinson), Lincoln (Canon Hole), Ripon (Canon Temple), Rochester (Canon Money). So that seventeen out of the twenty-three dioceses send *five* clerical representatives between them! It is quite impossible that such a council can command the confidence of the clergy, or can be supposed to make known the mind of the Church to the country.

Scotch General Assembly is a sufficient proof. Why should we not acknowledge what is the real need, and, undeterred by gloomy prophecies, move resolutely towards it?'¹

It is opportune to consider the needful reform of such assemblies, which, from lack of a representative character, can never secure the confidence of the Church, at a time when the Liberation Society is straining every nerve and making every effort to disestablish and disendow the Church. Our present condition too has been, and is, a continual source of *inward* disruption. The great religious revival of fifty years ago sprang from a desire to resuscitate the authority of the Church, to quicken her to a new vitality. If a free scope had been granted, if a full representation had been given, the dangerous tendencies then would have been escaped. The Church has suffered irretrievably from having too morbid a dread of change. In matters of organization to adapt herself to the times is strength and security. The Bishop of Tasmania in 1881 wrote to the public papers saying that in the Colonial churches synods of clergy and laity were the source of their security and unity. The *Guardian*, in reference to the Bishop's letters, wrote (March 9, 1881):—

'We believe that the Bishop of Tasmania is quite right in tracing the want of deference to episcopal authority to the too simply autocratic character which that authority has assumed, and in concluding that the diocesan synod is the great security for diocesan unity and life. The synod, moreover, should be above all suspicion of being composed of "episcopal nominees," and we think the Bishop of Winchester quite right in his assertion that this necessity is already felt and recognized in a considerable degree.'

In order to obviate in a measure the existing isolation between bishops on the one hand and the clergy and people on the other, many are of opinion that all bishoprics of future creation should have no claim, even by rotation, to a seat in the House of Lords. This would also, in a measure, tend to restore our episcopate to a more apostolic and primitive model. The Earl of Devon, at the recent Church Congress at Derby, expressed and urged this view upon the Congress. His Lordship said—

'I am sure that greater facility would be given for the creation of bishoprics if it were provided that only a certain number of bishops—say all the old historical bishoprics antecedent to Henry VIII.—should have seats in the House of Lords. The others would not be called upon to exercise any Parliamentary duties, would not be obliged

¹ *Guardian*, January 19, 1881.

to li
them
objec
bisho
numb

T
episc
and
the c
divis
of in
is ye
rath
the p

C
sider
is to
denc
episc
sion
with
exte
The
the c
cann
the m
ham
fact
dime
mere
assoc
allow
Sout
conso
hand
coun
only

1
of the
after
comm
simila
North
recom
catho
town
VO

to live in London, and consequently would be able to maintain themselves on a smaller income than a bishop at present needs. One objection that is not unnaturally raised to the multiplication of bishops—namely, that it would be impossible to introduce a large number into the House of Lords—would by this means be removed.’

There are three forms under which the deficiencies of the episcopate could be supplied: by independent, by suffragan, and by assistant, bishops. There can be but little doubt that the only real effectual remedy for our present distress is the division ultimately of our present dioceses and the creation of independent sees. We do not, however, think that the time is yet fully come to form such independent sees directly, but rather that approach must be made to them indirectly through the previous appointment of suffragans.

One point which should always be most carefully considered is the selection of the town from which the suffragan is to take his title, and in or near which his place of residence is to be established. It is most desirable as the episcopacy increases that the dioceses (except in the division of the large counties) should be made conterminous with counties. The county divisions regulate to a very great extent all the political, social, and judicial arrangements. The county town, with but few exceptions, should be made the city of the bishop's title and residence. In this light we cannot but regard the selection of Southwell as the seat of the new bishopric which is to embrace the county of Nottingham as an unfortunate mistake. It is selected from the mere fact that there is there a noble collegiate church of cathedral dimensions, with other buildings suitable for a chapter. The mere fact of a large and magnificent church and other old associations connected with Southwell should not have been allowed to outweigh other far more important considerations. Southwell stands on a branch line of railway merely. It is consequently comparatively difficult of access. On the other hand, Nottingham is the county town, and a very important county town. It has a population of 186,000, Southwell only a population of 11,000.¹ There can be but little doubt

¹ This selection of Southwell has been made in spite of the decision of the committee for the increase of the episcopate. That committee, after weighing the claims of the two towns, decide, ‘On the whole the committee recommend that Nottingham should be the see town.’ A similar mistake has most happily been avoided in the new diocese of Northumberland. ‘The Cathedral Commission, in its report of 1855, recommended the grand old minster of Hexham to be constituted the cathedral. Considering, however, the comparative insignificance of the town of Hexham, the committee *have no hesitation* in recommending that

also that before long the county of Derby, now included in the contemplated Southwell diocese, will acquire a bishop of its own. In all future creations of suffragans the idea of their becoming bishops of separated dioceses should always be the prominent consideration. We should thus be developing our episcopate from below upwards, exactly on the precedent, as Dean Bickersteth suggested, of the Peel and Blandford districts, where the minister ultimately becomes the incumbent of a separated parish.

In the following Tables we have ventured to indicate the dioceses in which suffragans seem to be immediately and urgently needed for the efficient administration of the Church. Where the old dioceses have consisted of two or more counties the divided dioceses are made conterminous with county boundaries. Where the counties are themselves divided the present political divisions of such counties are followed, except in the case of Lincolnshire. Among the suggested sees there are ten—those printed in italics—which are already mentioned in the Suffragan Act of Henry VIII. For the establishment of these ten nothing further is needed than for the Church to get that Act put in force. The names of the sixteen remaining towns mentioned in that Act are the following: Thetford, Taunton, Bridgwater, Nottingham, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bristow, Penrith, Huntington, Cambridge, Pereth, Berwick, S. Germaines, and Isle of Wight. Dover, to which a suffragan was appointed by the late Archbishop, is also one of the towns mentioned in the Act. It is not likely in these times that any of these, excepting the first four, are at any time likely to become episcopal sees. The Act, as it at present stands, does not give the Church the development which is now necessary to it. It is in the Northern and Midland counties more particularly, exclusive of the metropolitan or home counties, that the greatest deficiency is felt. Only two of the towns mentioned in the Act are north of the Humber—Hull and Berwick. To adapt an analogous Act to the present needs of the Church it would be necessary to incorporate into it the names of many towns which have risen into importance and position during the last 300 years. Or, still better, any Act relating to suffragans should allow, as in the case of new parishes, the establishment of a suffragan wherever the necessities of the Church indicate the need, and wherever an en-

the large, growing, and very important county town of Newcastle should be the see town, and its noble Church of S. Nicholas the cathedral.' (*Official Year-Book of the Church*, p. 304.)

Old Dioceses				New Dioceses			Remarks
Census of Old D.	Old Diocese	Jurisdiction retained	Population retained	Jurisdiction of New Diocese	Episcopal Town	Population of New D.	
640,000	Canterbury	East Kent	303,113	West Kent	Greenwich (?)	337,000	{ W. Surrey taken from diocese of Winchester Giving up West Surrey Ely giving up to Ipswich its Suffolk parishes Giving up two deaneries in Somerset to Wells, and two in Wilts to Salisbury Part of Shropshire is now in Hereford. Present population of Lichfield 1,520,000. Derby and Nottingham are deducted for Southwell. Monmouth should be added to Hereford from large diocese of Llandaff
1,600,000	Rochester	Mid "	285,060	West Surrey Mid " East "	Guildford Kingston Croydon	1,435,842	
1,300,000	Winchester	Hampshire	460,000	Southampton, I. of W. Chan. Isla.	Southampton	221,368	
519,286	Ely	Cambridgeshire	186,363	Bedfordshire & Huntingdonshire	Bedford	200,075	
601,374	Exeter	N. and E. Devon	354,886	South Devon	Plymouth	246,511	
700,000	Gloucester	E. Gloucestershire	250,000	West Gloucestershire	Bristol	384,012	{ Suffolk would take part of present diocese of Ely Colchester has in a measure been established
1,060,000	Lichfield	East Stafford	345,135	Shropshire	Shrewsbury	247,993	
				North Staffordshire	Stoke	302,597	
				South "	Stafford	269,944	
469,994	Lincoln	N. Lincolnshire	250,000	South Lincolnshire	Grantham	220,000	
1,990,000	Manchester	Manchester and Salford	580,000		Lancaster Blackburn Bolton Oldham	1,340,000	{
				Suffolk	Ipswich	356,863	
668,123	Norwich	Norfolk	444,000	Berkshire	Reading	218,382	
574,399	Oxford	Oxfordshire	176,650	Buckinghamshire	Aylesbury	176,277	
617,976	Peterboro'	Northamptonshire	272,524	Leicestershire and Rutland	Leicester	343,452	
800,000	St. Albans	Hertfordshire	202,990	Essex	Chelmsford	575,571	{
1,200,000	Worcester	Worcestershire	380,291	Warwickshire	Coventry	337,188	
					Birmingham	400,000	

dowment of modest yet sufficient amount renders the permanency of the see adequately secure.

Every diocese, except that of Lincoln, suggested for division in the above Table has a population exceeding 500,000. Lincoln is, however, added, as its population reaches 470,000, and it has also the enormous area, even after Nottinghamshire under Southwell is withdrawn from it, of 2,776 square miles. Episcopal supervision in such a case cannot possibly be anything more than nominal.

In the above Table we have omitted all reference to the dioceses of York, Ripon, and London. The county of York, comprising within itself the two former dioceses, requires urgently five new bishoprics. There can be no doubt that Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, and Hull, as well as Wakefield, have each pressing claims for a bishop of their own. The former is not only the chief town in the Eastern Division of the West Riding, but it is also the chief town of the county as far as a commercial centre is concerned, and has a population of over 300,000. Bradford is also the chief and leading town in the Northern Division of the West Riding, and this division alone has a population of 555,000. The above five new bishoprics, as a minimum, are required to render the episcopate for the county in any way efficient. The area of the county is 5,980, or nearly 6,000, square miles, or more than double the area of Lincolnshire. It has within its limits a population of 2,880,466, or nearly 3,000,000. To these facts of extent and population, there must be added a third—the rapid increase of population in the county in each decennial period. From 1871 to 1881 the population increased by 444,226. The present political divisions of the county into North, East, and West Ridings, and the latter again into its three political districts of Eastern, Northern, and Western, would without much difficulty, and with only a little adaptation in reference to Ripon, form a basis for the creation and localization of such bishoprics. To each of the seven bishoprics which would then exist in the county, a large and important population—a population which will have a very material influence in moulding the prospects of the Church in the future—would be attached. With seven bishoprics the smallest diocese in the county would still exceed 300,000 in population.

The sum required for the five new bishoprics, if the minimum endowment above spoken of were adopted, would scarcely exceed the endowment which is now required for the single bishopric of Wakefield. We are convinced that there would be less difficulty in raising an endowment to the

188
am
ex
mi
wh
the
be
pro
Br
do
nor
def
tha
and
in
nes
effi
pro
on

No
Ea
W
:
:
:
:
:

3,00
for
Bish
frag
bish
thus

mos
not
in p
indi
dioc
Suss
Suss

1
Ripo
prese
Divis

amount suggested for the five new dioceses than is now experienced in raising it for the one. The subscriptions promised for the Wakefield bishopric already amount to a sum which would competently endow the see, if established upon the lines advocated by the Earl of Devon. Let such an Act be passed that the other four bishoprics should be definitely proposed for creation in such towns as Leeds, Sheffield, Bradford, and Hull, and few who know those towns would doubt of a very ready and immediate response. Such northern towns are very willing to remedy any acknowledged deficiency in the work or ministry of the Church, provided that the scheme commends itself as needful, as reasonable, and as practical. Whatever may be the politics of Churchmen in the North, there is, we believe, an earnest wish and willingness among all her members that the Church should be able efficiently to fulfil her Divine mission. Any reluctance to promote the establishment of such new bishoprics will not be on the part of the laity.

North Riding	York	407,579
East Riding	Hull	302,970
West Riding, Eastern Division . .	Ripon (N.) ¹	} 640,558
" " " " " " " "	Leeds (S.)	
" " Northern Division .	Bradford	555,000
" " Southern Division .	Wakefield (N.)	} 973,359
" " " " " " " "	Sheffield (S.)	

In the case of London the population is in round numbers 3,000,000. Ten suffragan bishops would not more than suffice for so vast a diocese. They should, however, stand to the Bishop of London in a different relation from all other suffragans. They should not, we think, at least at first, become bishops of independent sees. Unity with efficiency would thus be preserved in the metropolis.

Other dioceses, which yet would allow of being divided most beneficially for the cause and work of the Church, are not referred to in the above Tables, as they fall below 500,000 in population, and the most glaring deficiencies are those indicated. Among these we might especially mention the diocese of Chichester, which comprises the entire county of Sussex. The parliamentary districts of East and West Sussex, with Lewes as the see town of the former, as

¹ The adaptation spoken of above would be that the bishopric of Ripon should retain that portion of the North Riding which it has at the present time, and also the northern sections of the Northern and Eastern Divisions of the West Riding.

Chichester is of the latter, would form large and compact dioceses. If the deaneries in Wiltshire now under Gloucester and Bristol were made over to the diocese of Salisbury, it is probable that the Bishop of Salisbury might be willing or even desirous to part with Dorsetshire, and that the name, though not the place, of one of the most ancient of the English sees—Dorchester—might be restored. The population of Wiltshire exceeds 250,000. In like manner, the double-titled see of Bath and Wells would for the work of the Church be most advantageously divided, Wells retaining Mid and West Somerset with a population of 248,890, and Bath the eastern or remaining division of the county.

In addition to the suffragans as above, in certain special dioceses and in certain special cases, as when the advanced age or infirm health of the bishop of a see renders it necessary, the assistant-bishop, *i.e.* a bishop without any distinct territorial assignment, might, with great advantage to the Church, be more generally called into action. At the present time the Church can only supply assistant-bishops by bishops returned from the colonies. But there ought to be no difficulty in having a measure devised and passed which would allow every bishop, with the consent and approval of his metropolitan, to ordain, if necessary, and appoint one or more such assistant-bishops to assist him under any difficulties or disabilities of health which might arise. The limitation of their duties might be expressed in the words of Archbishop Peckham. He required the Bishop of Lichfield, in consideration of his infirmities, to provide a suffragan '*qui circumeat prædicando, ecclesias dedicando, parvulos confirmando, et alia exequendo, quæ ad episcopale officium requiruntur.*'

All that is required to establish suffragans is enabling power on the part of the Legislature. This important subject has constantly occupied the attention of both Houses of Convocation. Resolutions have been passed in both Houses of both provinces on the necessity of the increase of the episcopate by the subdivision of sees, and by the revival of Henry VIII.'s Suffragan Act. The present Bishop of Lincoln in 1866, when a member of the Lower House as Archdeacon of Westminster, advocated application to Parliament for a permissive Bill for the subdivision of dioceses. The motion was carried, and presented to the Upper House. The Upper House unanimously agreed with this proposition. A committee of the Upper House was formed to consider the Act of Henry VIII. In the report of that committee it was said, 'We consider it desirable that action should be taken under

the
mitt
young
exist
Parl
been
dela
so l
lative
bish
the
to b
ther
give
that
need

arise
pres
In
to d
exco

the
Bish
and
anci
cons
exist
be n
be th
hear

the
Chu
ever
nam
and
to g
of t
nom
the
day
sim

the existing Act of Henry VIII., and the report of the committee recommends that an attempt should be made through your Grace to sweep away any difficulties which may have existed in the matter.' No Government without consulting Parliament would sanction the disinterment of an Act which has been in abeyance for 300 years. But why should the bishops delay to consult Parliament, since the present Premier even so long ago as 1850 expressed himself in favour of legislative measures for the augmentation of the number of bishops? Such a scheme, therefore, after having been under the consideration of Mr. Gladstone for over thirty years, ought to be fairly well matured in his own mind; and it would therefore, we would hope, only need some slight impetus given from without to bring it at once into operation. Seeing that an enlarged episcopate is now the urgent and crying need of the Church, why should it be any longer delayed?

We fear that even on the part of the bishops there might arise the common objection that by dividing dioceses the prestige and dignity of ancient sees would be diminished. In more things than one the Church of England is inclined to die of dignity, and like the frog in the fable to expire of excess of self-arrogation.

In answer to this very common objection we would quote the words of the Bishop of Durham in his late visitation Charge.

'When I was working for the division of the diocese,' says the Bishop, 'I was met again and again with the objection—frankly stated, and I doubt not sincerely held—that the dignity and prestige of the ancient see of Durham would suffer irreparably from the change. My constant reply has been that the dignity and prestige of the see existed only for the sake of its efficiency, and that the sacrifice must be made if it were needed. Now that it is made the change must be the subject of unalloyed joy and thankfulness to all that have at heart the well-being and efficiency of the Church of England.'

By thus developing our episcopacy, from below upwards, the ancient form of election might perhaps be restored to the Church. By the Suffragan Act permission was given 'to every archbishop and bishop of the realm and of Wales to name two honest and discreet spiritual persons to his Majesty, and that his Majesty should have full power and authority to give to one of such persons the name of a bishop of such of the sees aforesaid.' Our representative conferences might nominate two such persons to the bishop, and the bishop to the Queen. We might then hope to witness at no distant day in our conferences, diocesan or central, solemn scenes similar to one which has very recently been witnessed in the

Canadian Synod at the election of a missionary bishop for Algoma.

If the question of the extension of the episcopate were a question of the creation of new and independent bishoprics on the mediæval lines, the difficulties, as we have already said, would be great, involving as it would a seat in the House of Lords, a palace, and an income adequate to such position. There would not, however, be any lack of interest or any difficulty in raising sufficient sums for a fitting endowment of suffragan bishops without such expensive accompaniments. If such bishops were created with an endowment of a minimum sum of, say, 750*l.* or 800*l.* a year, we have no doubt that such a sum would be raised in every diocese if the bishop only expressed his desire for such a helper. A remarkable instance of such willingness has very recently been furnished in the diocese of S. Albans. The bishop had expressed his desire for a helper. A private meeting was held by a few of the leading noblemen and gentlemen of the diocese to furnish the funds for a suffragan bishop. It was unanimously determined to raise a sum of not less than 1,000*l.* a year for five years for the stipend of such bishop. Of that amount more than 500*l.* a year was promised in the room. In less than a fortnight the minimum sum was reached, without any public appeal whatever.

We have suggested for the new episcopate a position which certainly offers less of the good things of this world than are enjoyed by the richer and longer established sees; but we venture to hope that the Church yet counts among her sons many and many an earnest man who would not scorn the hard work, the simple living, and unostentatious life of those who would seek rather to be 'ensamples to the flock' than 'lords over God's heritage.'

1. L

2. W

ON
Life
upon
cons
frag
care
find
mod
not
occu
spic
are

is t
hanc
cons
defi
case
the
livin
are
mat
and
mat
nov
into

elem
is u
of t
kne

ART. IX.—LATTER YEARS OF BISHOP
WILBERFORCE.

1. *Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.* By his son REGINALD G. WILBERFORCE. Vols. II. and III. (London, 1881, 1882.)
2. *Words of Counsel on some of the Chief Difficulties of the Day in the Writings of Samuel Wilberforce.* Collected by THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A. (Oxford and London, 1875.)

ON the publication of Canon Ashwell's first volume of the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, following with ghastly closeness upon the author's unexpected death—victim as he was of conscientious overwork—we took occasion, in reviewing the fragment which he left us, to offer our estimate of the whole career and character of the great prelate. Nothing that we find in Mr. Wilberforce's two volumes leads us to retract or modify the opinions which we then ventured; so we shall not now retrace the trodden path. Sufficient profitable occupation is prepared for us in considering some of the conspicuous incidents of the Bishop's later life, exhibited as they are in the strong light of his son's memoir.

Chief among the materials of which the book is composed is the Bishop's private journal, which the biographer has handled with a strange unconcern for the well-established considerations which must, in the impossibility of creating definite and rigid rules for an infinite variety of speculative cases, define the limits of permission and of prohibition in the matter of literary revelations regarding persons still living or not long dead. Happily the objectionable passages are small in bulk compared with the long and varied array of matter valuable to all who study the vicissitudes of Church and State during an exceptionally interesting period of material progress in either sphere; and every day as the novelty of this gossip wears off will it fall more and more into its deserved condition of comparative insignificance.

Such a revelation of the defects which were a contributing element of the Bishop's many-sided character is a thing which is undoubtedly to be deplored. But the great essentials of that character will live down the accidents. Those who knew Bishop Wilberforce most closely were most clearly

aware of the abiding temptation—against which he so heroically laboured—of yielding to impulsiveness. That effusiveness to comparative strangers which was ignorantly set down to insincerity was in reality good-natured impulse overcoming cold-blooded caution. Such a disposition needed a safety valve, and unfortunately he sought it in a journal which he fondly believed to be secret. So that, in fact, the sum total—a considerable one we grant—of the damage is that the outsiders have been put on the level of the intimates, and that the imputation of feelings both quick and easily roused which had been a general though nebulous suspicion is now authenticated by more definite evidence. In short, we now know the worst of Samuel Wilberforce, and when that worst is dispassionately scanned, we may well say that any public man could esteem himself happy against whom nothing worse could be brought up. This is of course no excuse for the recklessness shown by the biographer in the publication, nor, to go further back, by the writer for perpetuating soliloquies which ought to have died in the conception, and for leaving their publication apparently quite unfenced. The Bishop used playfully to instruct neophytes in social etiquette in the three degrees of privacy which a letter-writer could impose on his epistle—‘Private,’ ‘Confidential,’ and, climax of all, ‘Secret.’ Was any ‘Secret’ stamped on the journal book?

But our chief concern is with Wilberforce the Churchman, and our readers will, we believe, thank us for passing away from this necessary reference to an unpleasant and, as far as reviewers are concerned, no longer novel, topic. Let us briefly inventory the contributions to modern Church history contained in these two volumes. The earlier one embraces the years spent in the diocese of Oxford, from 1848 to 1860; and the events which are its landmarks are the trouble with Mr. Allies, the Gorham judgment, the Papal Aggression, the unhappy controversy about adapted Roman books with Dr. Pusey, the revival of Convocation, in which, while contending with so many difficulties—not the least being those raised by his own brethren, and chiefly Archbishop Sumner—the Bishop bore himself so bravely and wisely; the Maurice case; the Ditcher and Denison suit; sorrows in his own family, from secessions and deaths; and the Divorce Act. The third volume completes the tale of the Episcopate of Oxford, from 1861 to 1869, and comprehends the few years spent at Winchester, from 1869 to the end of 1873. The prominent events of this period are the ‘Essays and Reviews’ affair; the acces-

sion of
Ritual
and a
Church
vision
scanda
Act.

It
consid
as it
inciden
Englan
its fri
more
which
space,
literat
indeed
not to
reveal
stone’
his de
Indian
which
plishe
wrenc
dicati

In
upon
their
we co
ledge
of the
which
the f
subtle
hoods
of the
Angl
last n
from

P
probi
than
ment

sion of Archbishop Longley; the Colenso trouble; the Ritual controversy; the increase of the Episcopate at home and abroad; the accession of Archbishop Tait; the Irish Church disestablishment; the Sisterhood question; the Revision movement and Westminster scandal; the Glengarry scandal; the Athanasian Creed defence; and the Judicature Act.

It is manifestly impossible for us to say anything worth consideration upon even the half of this long list, comprising, as it does, without a single exception of importance, every incident which made for the prosperity of the Church of England, or tended to check its progress and discourage its friends during a quarter of a century. We are even more unable to take that still wider survey of the Memoir which would invite us to indulge in, if only there were space, the piquant revelations of the wide world of politics, literature, and social life contained in this book: some, indeed, belonging to the category of things which ought not to have seen the light, but others most legitimately revealed—of which we may take as an example Mr. Gladstone's mysterious letter, written in 1865, on the morrow of his defeat for Oxford, proclaiming, as if they were a series of Indian Avatars, the three political 'transmigrations' through which he felt himself destined to pass: two of them accomplished—his severance from his old party and the University wrench; the third mysterious and future, but ominously indicative of an advance towards democratic doctrines.

In making our choice of one or two ecclesiastical questions upon which we shall dwell, we desire chiefly to consider their present practical value and interest. Unfortunate as we consider it to rake up such embers, we heartily acknowledge the extreme interest which attaches to the spectacle of the conflict of the variant phases of Churchmanship, of which Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey were so eminently the fuglemen, as brought out in the questions, with the subtle psychical continuity running through them, of sisterhoods, of spiritual relations between priest and penitent, and of the adaptation of Roman Catholic books of devotion to Anglican use. This subject, however, was discussed in the last number of this Review, and we hold ourselves absolved from reverting to it.

Perhaps no episode is more practically valuable towards probing and appeasing the discontents of the present distress than that of the Bishop's connexion with the Ritual movement, illustrated as it is by some interesting particulars of

the inner history of the Ritual Commission, which, it will be recollected, sat from 1867 to 1870.

In order fully to estimate Bishop Wilberforce's action at this crisis of modern Church history, in which, as he so clearly appreciated, more was at stake than the mere ceremonial under discussion, it will be well to ascertain from his antecedent declarations what had been his own attitude towards the ceremonial development in the Church of England, both in its earlier and in its more pronounced phases.

In touching on this question in our former article, we quoted an extract from an early journal of Archdeacon Wilberforce, in which he spoke with pious horror of Mr. Oakeley's very meagre ritual at Margaret Street Chapel, and we called attention to a paper read by him, as Dean of Westminster, at the Winchester Archæological Congress of 1845, which revealed a grasp of the new science of Ecclesiology which was singularly contracted and conventional for so gifted a thinker.

A few years later, at the end of 1850 and beginning of 1851, and when Dr. Wilberforce was well established upon the throne of Oxford, the outcry over Pius IX.'s re-establishment of a territorial episcopate in England—sensationally known as the Papal Aggression—was by the cunning manipulation of Lord John Russell distorted into a brawling attack upon the modest manifestations of ritual which are now with universal goodwill adopted by all sorts of clergy, from the Archbishop at Lambeth to the curate of the humblest mission church, and some of which have not long since been pressed as things indifferent, if not rather laudable, by the more moderate section of the Low Church party. The catastrophe of Mr. Bennett's expulsion, due to Bishop Blomfield's lack of courage, had accentuated the crisis, and at a moment when sympathy would have been as golden as scolding was leaden, a cold, discouraging pastoral from nearly all the Bishops seemed to complete the downfall of those who were striving to raise the level of public worship. Suddenly the tide was stemmed by the virtual reply contained in Bishop Phillpotts' own courageous pastoral. But at this dark moment of the searching of hearts the Bishop of Oxford was not found standing by his brother of Exeter. He was amongst the mixed majority who were responsible for the chilling pronouncement. All this is painful to revive, and we only recall it to show how much the Bishop had profited by his life's experience and the responsibilities of the episcopate. We believe that neither in his narrower nor in

his bro
tinctly
foundl
the per
and he
beauty
learn,
was th
in litu
and in
the mo
was no

An
selecti
confid
Word
and re
a Cha
Surrey
of Ox
rectne
upon
he ha
centur

W
Wilbe
missio
excite
preter
the ed
letter
Comm
made
Prev
ment
Lond
way
to ge
The
Palm
very
loss
as th
and
speci

his broader days did worship as a systematic science distinctly touch the sympathies of his nature. He was profoundly reverential, he loved beauty, and he valued art; but the personal had always a contest in him with the corporate, and he dreaded the results of crystallizing reverence, art, and beauty in the service of God. That which, however, he did learn, and learning it knew how to turn to valuable account, was the respect due to those with whom systematic worship, in liturgies, in forms, and in buildings, was a stay of the soul, and in their behalf he took up a championship which was the more to be respected because in it personal gratification was not the operative cause of his energy.

Any one who will be at the pains to consult the interesting selection from Bishop Wilberforce's writings published by his confidential friend Mr. Fosbery in 1875, with the title of *Words of Counsel on some of the Chief Difficulties of the Day*, and read successively *Use and Misuse of Symbols*, taken from a Charge delivered in 1845, when the writer was Archdeacon of Surrey, and from the Bishop's two last Charges to the Diocese of Oxford of 1866 and 1869, will, we think, recognize the correctness of our analysis of the Bishop's ritual position, both upon the points on which he had and upon those on which he had not modified his opinions during that quarter of a century.

We are able now after this digression to appreciate Bishop Wilberforce's feeling in the crisis of which the Ritual Commission was the visible symbol, while we compare the popular excitement arising from the increasing boldness of the special pretensions of so-called ritualism with the earlier scare over the ecclesiological advance which culminated in the Durham letter. The chapter dealing with the history of that well-known Commission is picturesquely, though not quite chronologically, made to begin with a letter from the Bishop to Sir George Prevost of October 18, 1865. This contains the announcement: 'I *think* that there is little doubt that the Bishop of London (Tait) will try to get some legislative action in the way of altering the rubric about ritual. He would first try to get the Government to undertake it, if not the Bishops. The 'Government,' we may note, was then passing from Lord Palmerston to Lord Russell. The Bishop goes on to speak very sagaciously of the confusion which must result from the loss of the actual vantage ground of tacit compromise, leading as that would to having to define everything which was lawful and unlawful, without which there would be 'no law.' He specially recites as the instance of what had better not be

defined 'the post of minister before the Communion table.' In conclusion he suggests two means of defensive action ; one, it must be owned, speculative, 'the clergy understanding one another,' but the other the practical one of an address to the Archbishop and to the Bishop of the Diocese.

In the preceding session the ritual scare had been promoted in the House of Lords by an insignificant and ridiculous personage, whose advocacy ought to have been presumptive against any cause which he had taken up, the senile Marquess of Westmeath. This was the end of a career during which he had often burst upon the public with spasmodic manifestations which were more varied than exalted. However, this strange champion of the faith seems really to have inspired the gentle Archbishop Longley with some apprehension, and he took up the idea that it would be advisable to issue an anti-ritual address, signed by all the Bishops. On this Bishop Wilberforce, very differently advised from what he had been fourteen years previously, wrote to his Metropolitan (December 16, 1865) a letter commencing : 'My own mind is distinctly against an episcopal address on the ritual question,' and gave excellent reasons for his conclusion ; 'but I doubt the constitutional correctness of these addresses. Each Bishop has of course a right to address his diocese.' But when they speak collectively it should be in synod.

Besides this, 'I am sure that the clergy are exceeding jealous of such addresses, and I believe that the laity would be even more so, if the address went against, instead of with, the popular opinion of the day.' Nor does the Bishop think the effect of the address would be good even if the Bishops could agree on it, for 'to get any agreement we must be most general in our terms.' They could not agree in detailed advice 'as to what part of the restored ritual we wished to discountenance.' This was well argued, for shirking detailed directions has always been a prime irritant in the anti-ritual mandates of prelates. The Bishop went on to instance Bishop Waldegrave, who would discountenance anything 'which advanced a step beyond Puritan Dissent.' Then he points out how such a document could be used to put down even such moderate ceremonial as that then carried out by the present Dean of York in Reading, from near which the letter was written. 'And this brings me to another most serious objection. There is, I believe, in the English mind a great move towards a higher ritual.' Even the Dissenters and the 'Scotch Puritan Establishment' showed it. 'I rejoice in the ground we have gained. I believe we should be better off if our

people
outrun
gained
the co
have e
this, tr
its pra
a short
to resu
would,
work,b
a capit

' Bu
your G
resolve
matter
conditio

' I.
would a
venture

' II.
(a)
adopted

(b)
to discou
(c).

room as
Times n

' I h
opinion
before y

We
convict
clearly
questio
that la
historio
any wi
was int
public
the fre
told di
Bishop
for it w
away f
Th

people desired yet further progress.' The risk is the priest outrunning the people. 'Now the ground which has been gained was gained by persons who at the time went beyond the common practice, and by bearing reproach for Christ have even now raised the common practice.' When he said this, true as it is, we doubt whether the Bishop fully grasped its practical force. The surpliced choir had been a reproach a short time before; what more was then the chasuble? But to resume. Such an address as the Archbishop contemplated would, so Bishop Wilberforce contended, throw all this good work back. We quote the conclusion of the letter integrally as a capital example of high but quite justifiable diplomacy:—

'But though this is my decided opinion, I would loyally support your Grace to the utmost limit of what I think lawful, if at last you resolve on any course. Only, may I suggest further that if this matter is to be discussed by us it should be under the following conditions:—

'I. There should be no circular notice of such discussion. This would assuredly get abroad, and of itself do much of the evil I have ventured above to suggest.

'II. There should be an absolute agreement:

'(a). That no address should finally be adopted unless it was adopted unanimously.

'(b). That it should state what we did, and what we did *not*, wish to discourage.

'(c). That there should be a pledge of absolute silence out of the room as to the whole subject, that neither the *Record* nor the *Church Times* might be able to blazon the matter abroad and stir up strife.

'I hope I have not wearied your Grace; but as you asked my opinion I felt bound in duty to put, as far as possible, my whole views before you.'

We have recapitulated this letter at much length, from our conviction of its extreme value as expressing most fully and clearly and withal unreservedly the views held on the ritual question not only by Bishop Wilberforce individually, but by that large phalanx of moderate High Churchmen ('the great historical party,' as they are fawningly called when there is any wish to cajole them) of which he was the spokesman. It was intended for only one eye, and now that it has been made public it is out of date. But if it could happily have come in the freshness of its authorship before the world it must have told distinctively, healthfully, and strongly, far more than the Bishop's Charges did, with all their superb richness of style, for it was these very qualities of style which called attention away from the matter.

The Archbishop, however, was not convinced by the

Bishop's letter, and in his reply explained that the Episcopal document should be one of counsel not of authority, but conceded that unless it were unanimously adopted, or nearly so, it would be useless.

'He anticipated no difficulty in getting a unanimous consent to the discarding of vestments and incense, and adhering to the surplice. The Archbishop also seemed to think from the letter that the Bishop looked forward to a general restoration of vestments and incense, which the Bishop's answer most emphatically contradicts :—

"December 24, 1865.

"I thank you cordially for your kind consideration of my objections. I need scarcely say that I will give my most careful attention to your answers. I will now only correct what seems to me a misapprehension of my meaning in my letter, into which some inadvertence of mine has, I fear, led your Grace. I did not mean to imply that I approved of the use of the vestments and incense; so far from it, I have prevented it in my diocese. What I did mean was that I thought our individual action, and not our collective, was our safe course. I venture, too, to think that there is a wide difference between addressing a brother Bishop and addressing the clergy.

"Such *advice* must, I fear, wear the aspect of an attempt to exercise unlawful authority."

This is a point at which we may reasonably note a peculiarity in Archbishop Longley's views, of which his friend's biographer does not take notice, but which exercised a strong because quiet influence on the progress of events. Genial and tolerant as he was, and little disposed to cut worship down to the dead Puritan level, there was yet one detail of ceremonial as to which he was inexorable. Yet in the few intervening years it has passed in the estimation of thoughtful men from the schedule of ultra-ritualistic enormities to that of the questions which may be calmly canvassed as having two sides to them by moderate men—as for example it has been by the Bishop of Durham in his recent Charge—just as the surplice in the pulpit was debated thirty years ago. We mean of course the distinctive Eucharistic dress.

In thus shutting his ears to a claim which could adduce the authority of our greatest divines down to the Restoration, the Archbishop merely showed himself a man of the generation to which he belonged, while in contrast, as is well known, his statesmanlike policy regarding the eastward position stopped any attempt to limit or stifle it on the part of the Ritual Commission. We now reach a fact which gave the key to the correspondence.

There had been a discussion at the meeting of the Bishops in the previous May, when Bishops Jackson, of Lincoln,

and S
of co
Bishop
presse
for the
what
duced
hinder
way,
ritual
&c., c
Palme
the E
of cur
yers,
Mr. (I
Hann
Phillip
lights,
pronou
able to
the Bi
After
Bristo
was a
the Bi
resolu
the m
desire
party.
opinio
are dis
Bishop
opinio
Londo
'thoug
fatherly
creased
Church
from th
would
'Th
the gen
possess

He
VOL

and Sumner, of Winchester, proposed a test case which would of course have brought the question to trial before the Courts. Bishop Wilberforce, while opposing legislation or prosecution, pressed fatherly counsel; Bishop Bickersteth, of Ripon, was for the case, so that a competent legal authority might declare what was the liberty of the Church of England, which produced the rejoinder from Bishop Thirlwall, 'May I ask what hinders your getting an opinion?' Mr. Wilberforce, by the way, forgets to refer to an episode of much importance in the ritual campaign: the case and opinion against vestments, &c., obtained by the Bishops from Sir H. Cairns, Sir R. Palmer, and Mr. Mellish, answered by the counter-case from the English Church Union of June 1866, which elicited a variety of curious and valuable opinions from various eminent lawyers, of whom Sir R. Phillimore, Sir F. Kelly, Sir W. Bovill, Mr. (Lord Justice) James, Dr. Deane, Mr. Coleridge, and Mr. Hannen, declared the legality of the vestments, and Sir R. Phillimore, Mr. James, Dr. Deane, and Mr. Hannen, of the lights, against Sir W. Bovill and Mr. Coleridge; Sir F. Kelly pronouncing no opinion; and all the opinions being unfavourable to the lawfulness of incense. But previously to this event, the Bishops had met in 1866, at the early date of February 5. After the statement from Bishop Ellicott, of Gloucester and Bristol, that Mr. Upton Richards had told him that there was a most general readiness to yield to the pastoral office of the Bishop, Bishop Harold Browne, of Ely, thought that the resolutions of what was legal and what was permissible, and the memorials before them, should be taken together. 'He desired to meet any overtures of peace from an extreme party.' Bishop Baring, of Durham, on the other hand, was of opinion that 'there should be no compromise with men who are disturbing wilfully and wickedly the peace of the Church.' Bishop Jackson, of Lincoln, strongly pressed getting a legal opinion and then going to the Courts. Bishop Tait, of London,

'thought the best course would be if the Ritualists would submit to fatherly counsel. The difficulty of the case was, he thought, increased because doctrine was involved. He said, "You must, in the Church of England, allow a large latitude of doctrine." He differed from the view of drawing a case for opinion, on the ground that it would be impossible to make a case wide enough.

'The proper mode of dealing with the case is, getting the Bishop the general controlling power intended by the rubric for him to possess. It was always intended that the Ordinary should have it.'

He added, however, that in order to meet the risk of

diversity, provision should be made that the Bishop should consult certain other persons, with laity learned in the law. 'The Archbishop should himself be bound to act with his vicar-general.' We dwell on these words, which show, whether the plan in itself would have worked or not, that Archbishop Tait's original fresh thoughts differed widely from the policy with which fate made him familiar, when he had placed himself upon the fatal incline of repressive legislation. The debate was continued on two more days, and was memorable for a sentence from Bishop Phillpotts, speaking with the experience of about ninety years, 'If you try to enforce the rubric you will have a rebellion; try to alter it, and you will cause a shipwreck.' Ultimately, when a division was taken, the address was supported by thirteen votes, and opposed by Archbishop Trench and Bishops Thirlwall, Wilberforce, Hamilton, Jackson, Ellicott, Campbell, and Fitzgerald. This was far from the virtual unanimity which the Archbishop considered essential, and so it fell through.

We may leap over a year, merely pointing out that in the interval the Bishop delivered a Charge, to which we have already referred, in which he dwelt with, so we think, too much pomp of language on the ritual question. February, 1867, found the Bishops again assembled on the ritual question, and sitting 'with closed doors.' Mr. Wilberforce does not seem to appreciate that this was no meeting at Lambeth, but one of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, and that its business was 'to consider the answer they should make to the Report of the Lower House on the ritual question.' That Report, emanating from a committee of the Lower House was written by its chairman, the Dean of Ely, now Bishop of Carlisle, and was a wise and temperate document, out of which a *modus vivendi* might have been developed. The answer, drawn up and moved by Bishop Wilberforce, and seconded by Bishop Tait, concluded: 'Our judgment is that no alteration from long sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.' It is obvious that, peaceful as the tone of this pronouncement may have been, it was too short and vague an answer properly to cover all the positions advanced by the Lower House. It was merely operative in shelving the one most promising, because most definite, scheme of reconciliation which had emanated from any constituted authority. General principles are all very well when they are likely to lead to definite results, but of this the Ritualists could not be certain. They desired to be told

what r
could
two si
becam
descri
Hamil
Th
threat
Church
ministe
Bishop
yet he
and Bi
by Bis
Bishop
of Lon
tuated
This w
specific
the Arc
home-t
but if t
I shoul
the Bis
meant
Shaftes
Archbis
settled
Gladsto
time, in
neglect,
Archbis
which t
Church
mination
the Boo
Convoca
A h
gallantly
conferrin
Bishop
on the
The Arc
Wilberfo
Archbis

what rites would in any case be allowed, and of what they could have no hope. Matters were thus at a deadlock, the two sides resting on their opinions, when affairs suddenly became very critical, and the Bishops had to hold a meeting, described in a letter from the Bishop of Oxford to Bishop Hamilton of March 6.

The cause of the crisis was that Lord Shaftesbury threatened a bill to annihilate the historical continuity of the Church in regard to vesture, and to reduce the dress of the ministering clergy to that of the Fiftieth Canon. This, as the Bishop truly perceived, would have been 'a suicidal step,' yet he found it favoured, not only by Archbishop Thomson and Bishops Baring, Waldegrave, Bickersteth, and Jeune, but by Bishop Harold Browne and Archbishop Longley. The Bishop seems at the meeting to have urged the inconveniences of Lord Shaftesbury, with his known and strongly accentuated views, constituting himself promoter of such a measure. This was in itself a good argument, but it naturally elicited a specific rejoinder, and he was met by the question, 'Then, if the Archbishop brought in such a bill?' His reply to this home-thrust was, 'I said I should deprecate any such measure, but if the Archbishop thought it necessary, and introduced it, I should not oppose it.' It was clear by what followed that the Bishop, in making this admission, said more than he meant to express. The practical conclusion was, 'that Shaftesbury should be hounded off by being told that the Archbishop was preparing such a bill, and a Committee was settled to draw it up.' The Bishop invoked the influence of Mr. Gladstone, always powerful, even when he was, as at that time, in opposition, to stay the disastrous policy; nor did he neglect, on March 7, to address a strong expostulation to the Archbishop, in which he took occasion to quote the answer which the latter had given a few weeks before to the English Church Union: 'I have already publicly declared my determination never to consent to any alteration in any part of the Book of Common Prayer without the full concurrence of Convocation.'

A hand-to-hand struggle then ensued, Mr. Gladstone gallantly throwing himself into the breach, and personally conferring with Archbishops Longley and Thomson and Bishop Tait. In the meanwhile another actor was brought on the scene, the late Lord Derby, then Prime Minister. The Archbishop and Bishop Ellicott saw him, and Bishop Wilberforce wrote to him. Ultimately, on March 26, the Archbishop wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:—

'Lord Derby informs me the Cabinet are unanimously of opinion that any proceeding in regard to recent ritualistic practices had better be taken by a Commission than through immediate legislation. He asks my opinion, and requests me to collect that of the Archbishops and Bishops, whether the inquiry on the part of the Commission should be limited to the rubric prescribing the ornaments of the Church and of the ministers, or should extend to other rubrics and other parts of the Book of Common Prayer. My own view is decidedly in favour of the limitation, and I will thank you to let me know your opinion at your earliest convenience.'

To this letter the Bishop replied as follows :—

'March 27, 1867.

'I am clear that the inquiries of the Commission should be limited to the rubric touching the ornaments of the Church and the ministers. I think it—after our experience of the last Commission—very important that the terms of the Commission should intimate that Convocation would be afterwards consulted. I reserve my own opinion that no legislation is best of all.'

After all, the inquiries of the Commission were not limited; and, as events turned out, it was fortunate that the Bishop's counsels, cautious as they might seem to be to a superficial judgment, were overruled. A large and powerful Commission of 'summities' in Church and State, sitting on the one Ornaments Rubric, must have justified such a draft on valuable time by rending it piecemeal. If they were the pack, it was the fox. On the other hand, a Commission, however magnificent, which was licensed not only to wander at its sweet will over the wide field of all the rubrics, but also to take the Lectionary in hand, was in fact empowered to pass in review the whole worship of the Church of England, and thus became an employment worthy of statesmen no less than of divines. So the electric current, thus widely diffused, became harmless. The Commission sat four years. Its new Lectionary and the Shortened Services Act are distinct gains to the Church; the proposed code of amended rubrics are an interesting contribution to liturgical literature; and the deadlock to which it brought the opposition to the Athanasian Creed and the Ornaments Rubric made it, in spite of itself, a signal benefactor to the Church of England.

No way mollified by the appointment of the Commission, Lord Shaftesbury moved the second reading of his bill on May 14, and the Archbishop in amendment moved its postponement for two months, which he carried by a majority of fifteen in a House of 107 peers. In the majority were the

Archb
in the

Th
Archb
June 1
betwe
upon i
who lo
ment,
which
Mr. W
correct
hardly
assemb
lowing

'Im
the mer
passu w
consiste
Ely (no
R. Phil
A. J. B.
Glouces
and wen
a third
really g
the final
the Com
Mr. Wa
few alter
was in
was the
'restrai
'prohibi
the elasti
regulated
these m
'I cann
I recogn
How oth
escape h

The
from th
blue-bo

'Sug
were laic

Archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin and six Bishops, and in the minority eleven Bishops. The bill was then dropped.

The Ritual Commission of twenty-nine members, under Archbishop Longley's chairmanship, met for the first time on June 17, and after holding nineteen sittings, which were divided between the examination of witnesses and deliberations, agreed upon its first Report on August 19. The minority of the body, who looked with more or less favour on ceremonial development, early associated themselves into a working party, in which the Bishop held a leading position. We may accept Mr. Wilberforce's narrative at this point as substantially correct, though we must observe that the term Committee is hardly a correct definition for the minority of a deliberative assembly. No one would call Sir Stafford Northcote's following in the House of Commons a Committee.

'Immediately on the appointment of the Commission, some of the members agreed to form a private committee, and to move *pari passu* with the meetings of the Commissioners. This committee consisted of Lord Beauchamp, the Bishop of Oxford, the Dean of Ely (now Bishop of Carlisle), Canon Gregory, the Right Hon. Sir R. Phillimore, the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, and the Rev. T. W. Perry. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol joined, but after one or two meetings deserted and went over to the other side. This committee, although less than a third of the whole body, was enabled, by showing a united front, to really guide the Commission, and to virtually settle the Report. At the final meeting two draft Reports were submitted for consideration by the Commissioners: one by Mr. Walpole, the other by Mr. Hubbard. Mr. Walpole withdrew his in favour of Mr. Hubbard's, which, with a few alterations, was adopted. This draft Report, as the diary shows, was in reality drawn by the Bishop; and the secret of its success was the moderation of tone and the judicious use of the word 'restrain' with regard to vestments, instead of the word 'abolish' or 'prohibit.' The main body of the Commissioners failed to perceive the elasticity of this word, which in fact did leave a loophole for the regulated use of vestments. Lord Beauchamp, at whose house these meetings were held, thus testifies of the part the Bishop took: "I cannot refrain from writing you these few lines to say how fully I recognise the discretion and skill with which you have steered us. How others could have been brought to agree I cannot divine. Our escape has been marvellous."

The official record of the adoption of this Report, taken from the minutes of the Commission as printed in its first blue-book, is as follows:—

'Suggestions for draft Reports by Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Walpole were laid upon the table.

'Earl Stanhope then brought forward the motion of which he had given notice at the last meeting.

'Mr. Walpole moved as an amendment, that the draft Report of Mr. Hubbard be taken as the basis to be now considered. Lord Stanhope thereupon withdrew his motion, and the amendment was adopted.'

In order to estimate the value of this noticeable pronouncement, we need only take notice of the two really important sentences:—

'We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the united Church of England and Ireland all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said united Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress. We are not yet prepared to recommend to your Majesty the best mode of giving effect to these conclusions, with a view at once to secure the objects proposed and to promote the peace of the Church; but we have thought it our duty in a matter to which great interest is attached not to delay the communication to your Majesty of the results at which we have already arrived.'

As Mr. Wilberforce points out, the one important word is 'restrain,' because it can as little mean by any natural use of language 'prohibit' as it means 'give rein to.' As no one, then, out of Nephelococcygia, considering the condition of England in 1867, as no one now, considering what it has become in 1883, would desire the pell-mell adoption of vestments; so all out of Nephelococcygia, Ritualists no less than Recordists, must desire in some way to 'restrain' that adoption. All accordingly ought to have welcomed the moderation and common-sense of the Report. If it required any further explanation this would be found in the qualifications appended, those of the signatory Commissioners:—

'We agree to the main proposition contained in this Report, and have therefore signed it, upon the understanding that it does not exclude the consideration of cases in which the authority of the Bishop and the rights of the parishioners and congregations are carefully guarded.

ROBERT J. PHILLIMORE.

A. J. B. BERESFORD-HOPE.

'In signing this Report, I think it right to express my conviction that any power to "restrain" the variations in respect of vesture to which the Report refers ought to be limited to cases in which "grave offence" is likely to be given by introducing such "vesture" into churches against the mind of the people; and also to state that by "aggrieved parishioners" I understand to be meant those who, being

bonâ fide
have a

Wh
it is al
the Re
does th
verifying
that of

'It
and bra
though
absolute
had all

Mr.
his son
read th

It i
printed
a limit
the ves
to perm
of two.
we hav
might l

The
in Apr

'Of
at all;
Report
it was a
evidence
was still
offence,
be remo
the Arch
vinced t
opinion,
each pa

The
Archbis

'I an
this from
Ely, Mr

bonâ fide members and communicants of the Church of England, have a reasonable ground for "complaint and redress."

'THOMAS W. PERRY.'

When we calmly weigh these very obvious considerations it is absolutely painful to read the passionate mistaking of the Report from the pen of Dr. Pusey, representing as that does the error of many more devoted Churchmen, whose verifying faculty can certainly not be placed on a level with that of the great Professor:—

'It seems to me a complete extirpation of the vestments, root and branch. I cannot conceive the work done more completely, though it might have been done in a more painful way. It is an absolute and complete defeat. It would have been far better to have had all Shaftesbury's bill, and let him do his worst.'

Mr. Wilberforce prints an able letter from the Bishop to his son, Ernest, now Bishop of Newcastle, who seems to have read the Report much as Dr. Pusey had done.

It is hardly needful to recapitulate from the minute book, printed in the fourth Blue Book, the various propositions for a limited permission, under certain specified conditions, of the vestments. These were all defeated, though one of them, to permit them in chapels of ease, was only so by a majority of two. Had it not been for the Archbishop's bias, which we have already noticed, we believe that some understanding might have been reached.

The second Report of the Ritual Commission was signed in April 1868. Mr. Wilberforce recapitulates it correctly:—

'Of the twenty-nine Commissioners, six did not sign the Report at all; four, including the Bishop, signed with qualifications. The Report recommended legislation on the subject of incense and candles; it was against this proposal that the Bishop protested. After hearing evidence, and after all the arguments which had been adduced, he was still of the opinion, which has already been so fully stated, "that offence, whether caused by excess or defect in Divine service, may be removed by strengthening the hands of the Bishop, with appeal to the Archbishop." The Bishop further protested because he was convinced that no law could regulate gesture and posture, which, in his opinion, were much better left to the good sense and good feeling of each parish.'

The Bishop's own feelings are well expressed in a letter to Archbishop Longley of April 17:—

'I am asked to send you the printed paper which will accompany this from Mr. Kempe (*sic*). It expresses the view which the Dean of Ely, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Hope, Sir R. Phillimore, and

myself (and, except as regards the possible legality of the altar lights, Mr. Coleridge) take of the second Report as agreed to. But as the appeal has been lodged since this paper was drawn up, some of us would be glad of the opportunity of revising it, if time allows, before it is formally attached to the second Report. I cannot say to you the pain it gives me not to assent to anything which has your sanction. I cannot but believe that our common aim would have been better promoted by an united advice that the Bishop and Archbishop should be empowered to stop these things, than by a divided Report advising the compelling the Bishop to act, and so, in my judgment, simply abrogating his office.

The conclusion of much divided counsels was that the Bishop of Oxford and Dean Goodwin signed the Report with a paper of reasons for not fully accepting it, and that Sir Robert Phillimore, Mr. Beresford-Hope, Mr. Hubbard, and Canon Gregory adopted that paper as their reasons for refusing to sign at all. Lord Beauchamp and Mr. Perry explained their dissent in carefully drawn papers, and although Dean Stanley and Mr. Coleridge signed, they jointly put in a plea for further liberty.

The machinery which the majority of the Commission proposed for dealing with vestments, lights, and incense was the Bishop, with an appeal to the Archbishop, and although 'restrain' was on their lips they seem to have thought of nothing besides suppression. The delators were to be one or more of the church or chapel wardens, or else at least five resident parishioners in parishes of more than 1,000 population, and three in those of less.

This was of course the cockatrice's egg from which were hatched those three aggrieved parishioners who have helped to make the Public Worship Regulation Act so odious and contemptible.

At this point Mr. Wilberforce's memoir quite loses sight of the Ritual Commission. Yet it made two more Reports; while from the eighty-sixth to the hundred-and-eighth and last meeting, that is from December 15, 1869, to June 28, 1870, the Bishop of Winchester acted as chairman, having been called to that post in consequence of Archbishop Tait's long and dangerous illness, which occurred before Bishop Jackson's appointment as Commissioner.

The third Report, dated January 12, 1870, deals exclusively with that which is after all the legacy for which the Commission will be remembered—namely, the new Lectionary, elaborated by a committee of the body and adopted by the entire Commission—with the lamentable deterioration, prompted, it would seem, by a cowardly dread of so-called public opinion,

the of
which
was s
the B

T
the w
wond
ful :
was n
Rubri
posse
Athan
out of
and u
In reg
impor
energ
wanti
in the
it can
difficu
the b
Engla
fourth
curios
stenti
the si
tions,
randu
Archb

'W
are un
Comm
felt by
accom

O
unani
with n
emerg
receiv
vocati
of Ch
phasia
the P
debat

the omission from the Lectionary of the lessons from Tobit which it had been proposed to retain. After all, the majority was small, and a fight of two days was maintained, at which the Bishop did gallant service on the right side.

The fourth and final Report, of June 12, 1870, embodies the whole proposal of revised rubrics, and has about it one wonderful characteristic for which we never can be too thankful: that whereas in the eyes of politicians the Commission was mainly set up to give decent interment to the Ornaments Rubric, and also that the latitudinarian faction believed they possessed in it a sure instrument for doing some harm to the Athanasian Creed, yet rubric and Creed both of them came out of the inquiry and stood in the Prayer-Book untouched and unscathed. It was like the enchanted maze in a fairy tale. In regard both to the important rubric and to the infinitely more important Creed, the enemy was there in a majority full of energy for the work of destruction. One thing only was wanting—namely, unanimity as to the policy to be adopted in the attack—and this indispensable preliminary was, when it came to be considered by so many such superior people, a difficulty past solution. Their language was confounded, and the builders had to abandon the rising Babel of a Church of England with maimed ceremonial and mutilated creeds. The fourth Report, with its accompanying memoranda, is a unique curiosity. There are twenty-seven signatures and two abstentions (Sir Robert Phillimore and Lord Carnarvon), and of the signers every one put his hand to one or several limitations, the most noteworthy one being an omnibus memorandum with seventeen names, of which the first was that of Archbishop Tait.

‘We, the undersigned members of your Majesty’s Commission, are unable to concur in the course which has been taken by the Commission with respect to the Athanasian Creed. The objections felt by several of us will be found stated, with the signatures, in the accompanying papers.’

Of course recommendations which had secured so little unanimity among their authors could not appeal to the public with much authority. Nevertheless the Shortened Services Act emerged from the waters, and the scheme of amended rubrics received for some years the respectful attention of both Conventions, while it is not due to any want of zeal on the part of Churchmen, but to grave considerations of prudence, emphasized as these were by the general election of 1880, that the Prayer-Book has not become the sport of Parliamentary debate.

The opposition to the Athanasian Creed was not, as might have been supposed, quelled by the *fiasco* in the Ritual Commission, and within two years it again broke out acutely. For the history of the conflict which raged within the Episcopate and in Convocation from 1871 to 1873, we refer our readers to the fourteenth chapter of the third volume of the *Memoirs*. For its happy ending Churchmen cannot be too grateful to the memory of Bishop Wilberforce. It was a glorious termination to his great career; more glorious because it was necessarily unostentatious and secret. Nor should the memory be lost of the public meeting in defence of the Creed, due to Lord Beauchamp's bold prescience, which was held in S. James's Hall on January 31, 1873. Before this gathering, innovators professed to disbelieve that there was an educated lay public opinion in the land in favour of the Creed. No one has since that day dared to commit himself to that paradox.

ART.

A Bi

THE

been

its se

vision

and to

T

tempt

comp

power

in Ch

capien

'to th

Privy

of the

ceedin

By

questi

'In

jurisdi

the m

such o

to desi

the cas

tical j

person

sufficie

able fo

office ;

compli

disobe

declare

vacant,

person

such of

the sam

And t

ART. X.—DEPRIVATION AS A PENALTY FOR
CONTEMPT OF COURT IN ECCLESIASTICAL
CASES.

A Bill intituled An Act to amend the Law as to Contempts of Court. (Presented by the Lord Chancellor.) Ordered to be printed 8th March, 1883.

THE Bill the title of which is at the head of this Paper has been introduced by the Lord Chancellor, and is now awaiting its second reading in the House of Lords. Some of its provisions appear seriously to affect the position of the Church, and to these we invite the earnest attention of Churchmen.

The proposed Act purports to alter the law as to contempts of Court, but under the word 'Court,' it (*inter alia*) comprises 'every Ecclesiastical Court in England having power to signify any contumacy or contempt to Her Majesty in Chancery with a view to the issue of a writ *de contumace capiendo*, under any statute,' and directs that it shall extend 'to the Court of Final Appeal before Her Majesty in the Privy Council,' and to 'all orders of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council incidental to any appeal or other proceeding in such Court of Final Appeal' (cl. 19).

By clause 16 it proposes, so far as relates to ecclesiastical questions, to enact as follows:—

'In any case of disobedience to any order of a Court of competent jurisdiction made against an individual holder of any office within the meaning of this Act, as to any matter concerning the duty of such office, which he may be required by such order either to do, or to desist or abstain from doing, it shall be lawful for the Court (being in the case of the holder of an ecclesiastical office a Court of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction) by further order, to be made on notice to the person so offending, to fix, and from time to time to enlarge, for any sufficient cause, such limited time as to the Court may seem reasonable for compliance with such order, on pain of deprivation of such office; and if within the time so limited, such order shall not be duly complied with, or if the same shall afterwards be further wilfully disobeyed, the office so held by such person may thereupon be declared by such Court to be, and the same shall become and be vacant, as if such person were naturally dead; and in that case such person shall not be capable of being again appointed or presented to such office until after the expiration of three years from the time when the same was so declared vacant.'

And then follows a proviso protecting the right of appeal.

The word 'office' is in clause 19 defined to mean 'all ecclesiastical preferments, promotions, and benefices, the holders of which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts of any diocese or province in England.'

This Bill, therefore, while it leaves unimpaired the previous coercive powers of the Ecclesiastical Courts, creates a new punishment for contempt by means of deprivation.

Those previous powers were twofold—imprisonment and suspension.

(1) Imprisonment, when the person who disobeys the mandate of an Ecclesiastical Court is pronounced contumacious and in contempt, and upon this being signified to the Queen in Chancery, the writ *de contumace capiendo* issues, under which the offender is committed to prison. This right is expressly reserved by and brought within the purview of the proposed Act (see clause 4); and although by clause 1 imprisonment for contempt is not to exceed three months, yet, as by clause 3 any continuance or repetition of the contempt renders the offender liable to subsequent imprisonment for a like term by summary order, and 'so on from time to time as often as the same shall happen,' the possible duration of imprisonment is by no means practically diminished.

(2) Suspension, '*ab officio et a beneficio*,' for a longer or shorter period at the discretion of the Court. This right has, after a protracted struggle, been decided by the House of Lords¹ to be properly exercisable by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Ecclesiastical Courts in cases of contumacy. It entails the loss to the offending clergyman of the intermediate profits of his benefice, and adequate provision can therefore always be made for the performance in the meantime of its duties.

It will be observed that by neither of these modes of punishment was the ecclesiastical status of the clergyman permanently affected. The former involved the loss of his personal liberty: the latter, the suspension for a time of his ministrations; but in either case he was capable of being remitted to his original position.

But deprivation, which was of a totally different character, was never permitted on summary process as a punishment merely for contempt. 'It does not appear' (said the Lord Chancellor, in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, 7 Probate Division, 101, when delivering the judgment of the Judicial Committee) 'that there is any precedent for the infliction of the penalty of deprivation for mere contumacy or contempt. In *Hebbert v. Purchas*

¹ *Mackonochie v. Lord Penzance*, 6 Appeal Cases, 434.

(*Law Rep.* 4 P.C. 312) such precedents were searched for in vain; and Lord Hatherley, delivering the judgment of the Judicial Committee, said, "Without pausing to inquire whether by any substantive proceeding founded on the ecclesiastical offence of disobedience to the Order in Council that has been already pronounced, a sentence of deprivation or amotion might have been obtained, we are of opinion that we cannot proceed to enforce compliance with the order which has been disobeyed by any summary process of contempt through the medium of amotion."

And the reason is obvious, if we bear in mind what the sentence of deprivation meant. As an ecclesiastical censure, whereby a clergyman is deprived of his parsonage, vicarage, or other spiritual promotion or dignity, it has always been regarded as an extreme penalty, and reserved for aggravated offences. Oughton, in his *Ordo Judiciorum*, tit. 137, in speaking of it says, 'Cum ob delicta majora quis ab ecclesiastico beneficio penitus amovetur.' And in the great oracle of ecclesiastical practice, Godolphin's book, a cause of deprivation is stated to be 'incurribleness, and obstinate disobedience to the approved canons of the Church, as also to the Ordinary.' But we need not revert to records of antiquity. It will suffice to refer to one or two high legal authorities of modern times. Lord Justice Thesiger,¹ after speaking of suspension as a punishment for contumacy, added,

'Deprivation and degradation, as punishments for ever altering the status of an offending clergyman, stood upon a different footing.'

And Lord Justice James, in the same case, said :—

'The Ecclesiastical coercions were, in the case of a clerk, suspension *ab officio et a beneficio*, to be followed, if necessary, by the ultimate coercion of excommunication. I leave out deprivation and degradation, because I conceive them not to be so much coercions as final and irreversible sentences pronounced on offenders to whom no hope of restoration is left.'

Such being the nature of deprivation, it follows, almost as a matter of course, that it could only be pronounced by a formal sentence upon the hearing of a suit in which specific articles were charged and proved against the offender, and when the Court, therefore, had the fullest means before it of carefully weighing the gravity of the offences charged, in connexion with all the attendant circumstances. 'Deprivation,' says Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge, 'could not take place except with all the formalities of a plenary suit.'

¹ *Martin v. Mackonochie*, 4 Queen's Bench Div. 727.

What, then, is the sudden emergency, what the overwhelming dangers, which have caused Parliament to be invoked to arm the Ecclesiastical Courts with this new and formidable weapon?

It could hardly be the desire to punish more severely what is necessarily felt to be the unseemly spectacle of clerical insubordination. For, setting aside the fact that no legal punishment ought to be merely vindictive, and that the Ecclesiastical Law especially is never weary of declaring that it acts solely for the reformation of the offender and for the benefit of the Church, we cannot but think that the Ecclesiastical Courts might safely trust to protracted imprisonment and the temporary loss of subsistence for the family, as sufficiently deplorable remedies to cure the feverish vanity and swelling pride, to which some rather hasty critics are fond of attributing every symptom of resistance on the part of the clergy to constituted authority.

Another possible reason might be suggested, that, with a view to satisfy public opinion, a shorter and sharper method of coercion is required, which, while more effective for its purpose, would be less likely to attract attention or to arouse sympathy. The impolicy, at all events, of Mr. Green's long incarceration has come home to an inconveniently large number of persons who, without being High Churchmen, are not admirers of the Church Association. We venture to think that anyone who could propose such a remedy for feelings thus excited is imperfectly acquainted with the nature of the disease, or with what is known as human nature. For so deeply implanted in the minds of Englishmen of the better class, certainly in the minds of English Churchmen, is the principle of submission to law, that when Courts are felt to be its true exponents, whatever may be the resistance in individual cases, there is not on the part of the bystanders any acquiescence in or toleration of disobedience. It may be almost assumed as an axiom, that the necessity of increased powers of compelling submission to judicial decisions is in the inverse ratio to the respect paid to the Courts by which they are pronounced.

If, in fact, there does exist any such acquiescence or sympathy, may it not be rather attributable to the distrust which has unhappily arisen in the minds of many Churchmen with reference to the constitution of the present Ecclesiastical Courts? In saying this, we do not venture to impute the slightest blame to the Courts themselves. But it is useless to disguise the fact that, owing to the extreme and almost unique

diffi
the
imp
and
othe
in t
vacu
and
mot
whic
This
Judi
it ca
min
of in
own
wild
appe
not
grea
man
prin
man
a ver
they
that
overs
legis
A
any
but t
sugg
For
reach
missi
Eccle
missi
Bisho
ford,
of D
Sir R
Dean
clear
opini
respec

difficulty of the subjects with which they have had to deal, to the multiplicity of the interests involved, and to the all but impossibility of discerning the right path when the spiritual and temporal jurisdictions shade so imperceptibly into each other—combined with what we conceive to be great defects in their own constitution and procedure—there have been a vacillation and inconsistency in some of their judgments, and a tendency, we must believe from the best and highest motives, to substitute compromise for decision in others, which have left an uneasy impression on too many minds. This feeling probably culminated in the final decision of the Judicial Committee on the Ornaments Rubric Question. For it cannot be denied that the ordinary Davus-like English mind, not versed in legal subtleties, and ignorant of that path of inquiry which led the Judicial Committee (after, it must be owned, some meanderings) to their ultimate goal, was bewildered by the discovery that a rubric which at first sight appeared so simple, and the observance of which was made not optional but imperative, really bore in the eyes of those great lawyers a meaning which had baffled the acumen of many a legal *Œdipus*. It is true that this did not touch the principle of submission as a general duty, but in the view of many even of those who held Ritualism in horror, it made a very sensible difference in the tone and temper with which they regarded the conduct of offenders, who might think that in this particular instance the Judicial Committee had overstepped the border line which separates judicial from legislative functions.

Apart from the above considerations, we are not aware of any peculiar exigency which calls for the proposed change, but there are special circumstances which seem to make its suggestion at the present moment singularly inappropriate. For in the year 1881, when discontent and difficulty had reached their climax, Her Majesty appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. When we find amongst the Commissioners appointed the names of the two Archbishops, the Bishops of Winchester, Oxford, and Truro, Lords Bath, Blachford, Chichester, Coleridge, Devon, and Penzance, the Deans of Durham and Peterborough, Drs. Westcott and Stubbs, Sir R. Phillimore, Sir R. Cross, Sir Walter James, and Dr. Deane, not to mention others of the highest reputation, it is clear that it was intended to be, and was, a body whose opinions and representations would command the deepest respect, and would be likely to influence future legislation.

It is understood that this Commission has been actively prosecuting its inquiries, but its actual proceedings are at present shrouded in mystery, except that there is good reason to believe that its Report will very shortly appear. We have, indeed, a glimpse of the views and hopes, with reference to it, of one of its most distinguished members, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, whose voice can now only speak from his grave. For the recently published work of Mr. Beresford Hope on *Worship and Order* contains the following note (p. 297):—

‘This is a fitting place to note that in the last conversation which I had upon Church questions with Archbishop Tait, for whom I cherish a very deep respect and affection, about the end of July 1882 he acknowledged himself a convert to separate judgments in contrast to the collective judgment which marks the decisions of the Judicial Committee, and expressed the hope that the result of this Commission might be the constitution of some reformed tribunal, before which the Ritual questions might be tried again, without respect for the existing judgments.’

It will be remembered that Archbishop Tait was himself one of the assessors in the case of *Ridsdale v. Clifton*.

Now, we submit to the judgment of English Churchmen, whether they agree with or differ from the views we personally entertain, that the present at any rate is not the befitting moment to rivet a new chain upon the necks of the English clergy. At a time when the relations of Church and State are so nearly thrown out of gear that some are beginning to despair of any restoration of their harmonious action, while those who most deeply value the inexpressible benefits resulting from the continuance of the connexion between them are watching with breathless anxiety the course of events, we deprecate, almost passionately, any premature movement which may occasion needless friction and disturbance. There is for the moment a lull, and we are not aware of any case either pending or in the immediate future which could call for the operation of more stringent powers. Why should not that part of the Bill which deals with ecclesiastical questions be at least postponed until the result of the Ecclesiastical Judicature Commission has been ascertained? We may then hope that some new *modus vivendi* will be found which may reconcile the respective rights and interests of Church and State—in which case all questions of coercive jurisdiction must necessarily come under review, and most probably under new conditions, which would render intermediate legislation vexatious and oppressive. There is also the danger that if this

Bill
to th
that
whic
V
sang
objec
that
desir
draft
differ
those
as we
It ca
hastil
smou

Bill be passed in its present form, we shall be told, according to the 'Vestigia nulla retrorsum' cant of modern legislation, that Parliament in its wisdom has taken a step in advance which can never be retraced.

We plead at least for delay. Nor do we plead without sanguine hope. The rest of the Bill is open to no similar objection, for it is only when we reach ecclesiastical questions that we enter into the sacred domain of conscience. The desire of symmetrical completeness may well have led the draftsman to bring together cases which are really widely different; but the Bill itself is happily now in the hands of those who, while vigilant in guarding the sanctity of law, are, as we believe, also keenly alive to the interests of the Church. It cannot be that those hands will, at so critical a moment, hastily and without excuse throw a new firebrand into the smouldering heap of theological controversy.

ART. XI.—ON THE USE OF UNFERMENTED WINE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

1. *Passover Wine.* By NORMAN KERR, M.D., F.L.S. (London, 1883.)
2. *The Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, February 10, 17, 24, March 3, 1883.

OUR recent article in which it was shown that the use of Unfermented Wine in the Holy Communion could claim neither the sanction of the New Testament nor of the Primitive Church, has, as we anticipated, called forth a certain amount of criticism and remonstrance. It appears desirable to add a few remarks with regard to (1) a lecture delivered by Dr. Norman Kerr, in the rooms of the Medical Society of London, on 20th February, 1883, "containing a statement of the truth as to 'Passover Wine,' and a refutation of certain charges of the *Church Quarterly* reviewer;" and (2) some correspondence in the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle* occasioned by our observations on certain points which appeared to us open to objection in the policy of the Church of England Temperance Society and the management of the newspaper which is its weekly official organ. A few supplementary illustrations of the positions taken in our article will, so far as we are concerned, close the subject.

Two preliminary observations may be made. To some of our readers it may have seemed that an article upon this subject was a work of supererogation. We certainly wish that it had been so, but since the publication of the article additional evidence has reached us showing that the use of the so-called 'unfermented wine' is increasing. Dr. Kerr also in the lecture on 'Passover Wine' addresses 'the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the Church of England' in the following terms:—

'This appeal, though before you for little more than a year, has met with a reception far beyond my most sanguine expectations. The force of the argument, the reliability of the evidence, and the reasonableness of my request, have not only been widely conceded, but in a large and increasing number of churches the Incumbents have practically responded to my appeal by adopting unintoxicating wine either at some or at all of their Communion Services' (p. 4);

1883.

adding
more w
men" in

We
and has
position
liberty t
was take
from an
ing, and
work in
which, if
it of larg

Othe
unnecess
'speak w
(p. 435),
in his bo
the wine
vined o
arrived,'
head of
'Passover
any offer
in referen
which the
communi
readers c
language

Speak
fraught w
reformed

'So rea
drinker my
Communion
I would as
of a mania
himself.'

Again

'It oug
Band of H
is a poison.
ing drink a
shocked?
taught about

adding (p. 25) that his appeal has been 'more widely and more warmly responded to' by some of "the highest Churchmen" in the country' than by any other.

We may inform our readers that the article was suggested, and has since been approved, by those whose ecclesiastical position and knowledge of the question would, if we were at liberty to mention their names, amply justify the step which was taken with the twofold object of protecting communicants from an innovation at once utterly unauthorized and distressing, and to disengage, so far as we might, the Temperance work in the Church from associations entirely foreign to it, which, if permitted to link themselves with it, might deprive it of large and influential support.

Others may have thought that the tone of the article was unnecessarily severe. We were careful in that article to 'speak with respect of Dr. Kerr's own philanthropic labours' (p. 435), to inform our readers of the fact, which is not stated in his book, that he had read 5,000 volumes 'with reference to the wine question,' adding that 'he is, no doubt, sincerely convinced of the soundness of the conclusions at which he has arrived,' while observations, of which he complains under the head of 'Specific Charge of Borrowing' in his lecture on 'Passover Wine' (p. 5), were neither conceived nor written in any offensive sense. But a few specimens of language used in reference, be it remembered, to an immemorial usage with which the most sacred experiences and memories of devout communicants are associated, shall now be produced, and our readers can then judge for themselves whether or not our language was unnecessarily severe.

Speaking of 'the Sacramental use of a narcotic poison, fraught with peril both to the bodily and Christian life of the reformed drunkard,' Dr. Kerr says (*Wines* &c. p. 126):—

'So real is the danger that, Churchman as I am, even when a drinker myself, I never allowed any reformed drunkard to go near a Communion-table where an intoxicating liquid was presented. . . . I would as soon have thought of putting a loaded pistol in the hands of a maniac in a lucid interval, bidding him take care not to shoot himself.'

Again (p. 151) we read the following:—

'It ought not to be forgotten that there are large numbers of Band of Hope children who have been truthfully taught that alcohol is a poison. When on joining the Church they are offered intoxicating drink at their first communion, will not their moral sense be shocked? Will they not naturally reason, "Surely what I have been taught about alcohol being a poison, and intoxicating drink poisonous,

must have been utterly untrue. If intoxicating wine is an appropriate emblem of Christ's blood it cannot be poisonous, it cannot be injurious to the body, and it cannot have a tendency to narcotize or paralyse the mind?"

In *Passover Wine* (p. 27) he returns deliberately to the subject under the heading 'Sphere of Grace,' while 'unequivocally disclaiming any disparagement of "Sacramental grace" or "the grace of God"':—

'As grace does not cut short an attack of continued fever, so it does not protect the whole nature of certain reformed drunkards from being set, as it were, on fire by a draught of intoxicating drink at the table of the Lord, which conflagration has a purely physical origin. I would that it were not so, but my business is to speak the truth, and I can most solemnly assure your lordships, and you, gentlemen, that this physical conflagration is a stern reality which must be met by a physical remedy—viz., total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks.'

A circular widely distributed in connexion with the sale of 'Wright's Unfermented Wine,' by the Rev. William Reid, D.D., Edinburgh, written some years ago, contains the following passage, as the sequel of a vivid description of the results of drunkenness:—

'And then reflect that there are those who contend that some proportion of the prime agent in this widespread demoralization is essential to a valid observance of the most sacred ordinance of the Church; and that the cup of blessing should contain some proportion of man's worst curse.'

Lastly, the editors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary* speak of

'Exchanging the wine which mocks and deceives for the uncorrupted "fruit of the vine," on which a blessing may be freely invoked without any sense of incongruity, and without exciting aversion and disgust.' . . . 'What God has not joined,' they say, 'may be lawfully sundered whenever a laudable purpose is to be attained; and while no sacred principle binds the table of the Lord to the vendor of intoxicating and mere fictitious wines, a separation between them would withdraw from that "mystery of iniquity," the wine trade, a patronage and implied approval which is simply shocking.' (Second edition, p. 286.)

I. Although Dr. Kerr's pamphlet is entitled *Passover Wine*, only six out of thirty-one closely-printed pages are concerned with that subject, the remainder being occupied by various criticisms on the *Church Quarterly Review*. At the outset we must apologize to Dr. Kerr for one unfortunate oversight, which was certainly careless, but was as certainly

unim
Aks
pass
So
into
result
I
lang
ment
of ec
him
read
were
supp
which
to 'o
learn
repre
He n
book
'stom
as 's
puzzl
theol
S. Pa
view
of cri
Kerr
to ach
given
O
erudi
the T
Euch
inten
talk
deser
ackno
to the
tary
Eccles
chapt
Anac
Bisho
exege

unintentional. It was said (p. 441) that in his remarks upon *Ahsis* our author had omitted to quote Isaiah xlix. 25. This passage is mentioned in *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*. So far, however, from proving that *Ahsis* was free from intoxicating qualities, the verse very distinctly describes the results of maddening intoxication.

In regard to other charges described by Dr. Kerr in language of which the strength proves the force of our arguments, we may say generally that, in some cases, his knowledge of ecclesiastical history and theology is insufficient to enable him to understand the reasons for our criticism; in others our readers can judge for themselves whether or not these criticisms were well founded. Dr. Kerr's own pamphlet seems to us to supply its own answer. Had we been guilty of the conduct which he ascribes to us, we could not deserve his tribute (p. 29) to 'our sincerity and earnestness,' as well as to 'our ability and learning.' Dr. Kerr complains (p. 10) that we (p. 441) misrepresented his design in the 'Scriptural wine part of his book.' He now informs us that these portions of the first part of the book referring to the original Bible words for 'wine' and 'strong drink,' and to some Biblical texts, were merely tendered as 'suggestions towards the elucidation of some obscure and puzzling passages of Scripture in deference to the critical and theological character of the assembly in the Chapter House of S. Paul's.' We certainly thought that there was *some* object in view in devoting so considerable a part of the book to this kind of critical exegesis. However, we trust that we have done Dr. Kerr no serious wrong, for in *Passover Wine* (p. 29) 'he desires to acknowledge fully the fair and accurate statement we have given of the real object of his book.'

Our author is very angry at the supposition that his erudition is to any considerable extent indebted either to the *Temperance Bible Commentary* or Mr. Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*. It, of course, suits Dr. Kerr to imply that we intended to charge him with dishonourable borrowing, and to talk of 'treating this imputation with the contempt it deserves:' but, as a matter of fact, we spoke of 'his candidly acknowledged solution of the Bible wine question,' referring to the glowing eulogium upon the *Temperance Bible Commentary* with which chapter xvii. of *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical* is closed. We should also have supposed that chapter iii., on 'The Wine at Cana,' the quotation from Anacreon (p. 70), the decree of Pope Julius I. (p. 137), and Bishop Gobat's testimony (p. 141), with other evidence and exegesis, had been, at least, suggested by the *Temperance Bible*

Commentary, just as the passages from Dionysius Barsalibi, Johannes Beletus, Durandus, and S. Thomas Aquinas may reasonably be supposed to have been originally brought under Dr. Kerr's notice by a perusal of the *Notitia Eucharistica*.¹

On p. 9 we read 'Curious Charge of Alcohol no Medicine,' with which we may class the section, 'What is Alcohol?' (p. 15). In the former case (p. 444), we had no intention of implying that Dr. Kerr would not prescribe alcoholic liquors under any circumstances; in the latter (p. 448), we were obviously, although not, perhaps, quite accurately, using the term 'alcohol' in the restricted sense of fermented beverages, as we presume is the case in the following passage, which, we think, forms an ample justification of our remarks:—

'There were many alcohols . . . but of the least poisonous, the ethylic, as found in the finest and rarest fermented wine, it could only be said it was an irritant, narcotic poison. It vitiated the blood, inflamed the stomach, overtaxed the heart, destroyed the kidneys, hardened the liver, and softened the brain. It dimmed the intelligence, darkened the judgment, and paralysed the will. The physical effects of alcohol did verily disclose—

"A realm of death! and on this side the grave."

(Address by Dr. N. Kerr at Exeter Hall, *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, May 14, 1881.)

We may add that our remarks (pp. 437-439) were simply intended to show that the variety of medical opinion as to the value of alcoholic liquors is so great that their dietetic value is far from being disproved. Whether a pint of pale ale contains $2\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of alcohol, or 1 oz. 12 grs., as Dr. Kerr informs

¹ Compare pp. 883-885 with *Wines*, &c. pp. 137-140. In reference to other criticisms upon our article made in *Passover Wine*, we would point out both to Dr. Kerr and also to those clergymen of whom he speaks (p. 14) as 'not so familiar with other languages, especially Hebrew, as they had been in their undergraduate days,' that Aquinas did not write 'in calice comprimat' (*Passover Wine*, p. 6), but 'in calicem prematur'; that while 'uvae' (*ib.* p. 6) may sometimes be printed (as it is in the work of Jacobus a Vitriaco) 'vuae,' it is not likely that it was so written by Durandus; if Dr. Kerr intended to offer *facsimiles* of old editions, he should have reproduced 'calicē' from the *Summa*. Labbe is not printed with an accent. 'Josh.' is, we believe, given in Webster's *Complete Dictionary of the English Language* as the usual contraction for Joshua, and Joe. for Joseph. We certainly confess that we thought 'Josh. Hall,' like 'Labbé' and the 'Angelic Doctor,' indicated a want of familiarity with the works quoted. *προσφοραν* was a misprint, as Dr. Kerr might have seen. On p. 457 it is printed correctly. We regret the mistake, which, even if it had occurred in *Wines* &c. would have been trifling indeed, compared with Dr. Kerr's translation of *προσενίκατε* 'approach.'

us in *Passover Wine* (p. 14), or simply 1 oz.,¹ depends entirely upon the particular kind of pale ale of which an analysis may be made. We did not doubt either Dr. Kerr's veracity or yet the correctness of the Science and Art Department. But we do protest against such names as those of Dr. Andrew Clark, and Sir William Gull being introduced into the question of the use of unfermented wine at Holy Communion on the supposition that they meant to imply that ordinary wine drunk in strict moderation is an irritant, narcotic poison, because they described anhydrous alcohol as such.

For some reason or other, which we cannot explain, Dr. Kerr is sensitive at our description of *Wines &c.* as a 'popular Temperance Handbook' (p. 436). We have only to reply that at the close of his work there is an advertisement in which five other books are described as 'Popular Temperance Handbooks uniform with *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*.'²

II. Having now disposed of Dr. Kerr's principal criticisms in the text, and of his smaller ones in the notes, we pass to another class of objections made by the Church of England Temperance Society. While we see no reason for withdrawing the criticism which we then ventured to make upon those features of the policy of the Society which appeared

¹ See the report of a case, *Leah, appellant, v. Minns, respondent*, *Daily News*, March 6, 1883.

² We do not deal with Dr. Kerr's attempted defence of his arguments based on 1 Cor. xi., the Apocryphal Acts, the Julian Decree, Anacreon, the use of 'Tirosh' in Hosea iv. 11, simply because it is mere trifling to reply to a writer who is unaware of the connexion between the Agape and the Eucharist, the Gnostic character of the Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew, the real nature of the Julian Decree, and the absurdity of imagining that Anacreon meant unfermented grape-juice when he spoke of *oivos*, or that an inspired Prophet could possibly class the use of such a fluid with whoredom and intoxication. As 'Timothy's wine' is mixed up in *Wines &c.* (pp. 107-109) with descriptions of the 'grape cure,' 'unfermented wine for a cough,' and an attempt to show that in 1 Tim. iii. 8 *oivos* is used for unfermented wine, we think that the inference we drew (p. 449) is not unnatural, although Dr. Kerr does give three extracts about 'medicinal intoxicating wine' as well (*Wines &c.* p. 107). We have nothing to retract in our observations on Dr. Kerr's use of the authority of Professor Ramsay or Mr. Scudamore. We are charged with 'a breach of the ordinary laws of courtesy and just dealing' because we spoke of carelessness in administration of the sacraments being the result of self-constituted ministries. It will, perhaps, be a sufficient reply if we present Dr. Kerr with the following extract: 'The Synod of the Reformed Church of Basle has resolved by a majority of two to one, after long consideration, that Baptism shall no longer be a condition precedent of admission to Holy Communion.' (*Guardian*, March 14, 1883.)

to us open to objection, in regard to 'the Blue Ribbon movement,' and the admission of the 'Scripture Wine Question' with references to the use of unfermented wine in Holy Communion into the pages of the *Chronicle*, we are quite willing to judge the Society, as Canon Ellison desires, 'in a spirit of generous confidence.'¹ We are thankful to accept his assurance that *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical* has not been on sale at the depôt of the Society, and if we add that we relied upon an advertisement in which the book was so described, we only do so in order to show that we were not writing without some ground to go upon. We can well believe that the Executive Committee of the Society, as Canon Ellison (*Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, February 10, 1873) informs us, have had pressure brought to bear upon them to admit books and tracts bearing upon this question, which, we are glad to learn, have been 'uniformly refused.'² But the fact is that in our article we expressly stated that 'we did not suppose that the opinions of Dr. Kerr were likely to be adopted by the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society in their official capacity.' We did, however, think that these opinions were in one shape or another—for the instances adduced in our article were by no means exhaustive—receiving attention in the *Chronicle*, which would not conduce to the best interests of the Society, and accordingly it is with great satisfaction that in the issue of that paper of March 3, 1883, we read the following paragraph in a letter signed 'Norman Kerr':—

'I am not sorry that I have nothing to thank you and the Committee for, while you have pursued your "warm neutrality" with your warm side to the allies of the Reviewer and your cold side to me. In this matter I care nothing for either total abstinence or moderate drinking, nor for any society or party. Like Hal of the Wynd, I fight for my own hand, and I care not whether you are against me or for me.'

We did not need Dr. Kerr's assurance (*Passover Wine*, p. 12) to make us believe that Canon Ellison was 'honestly opposed to his views on wine.' To have imagined that Canon Ellison approved of them would, indeed, have been inexcusable.

While we do not doubt that both Canon Ellison and the Executive Committee acted with the best intentions in regard

¹ See his letter printed in the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, Feb. 10, 1883.

² 'So far,' says Dr. Kerr (*Passover Wine*, p. 12), 'from the book being on sale at the Society's depôt, I have received letters from clergymen commenting in strong language at not being able to purchase a copy when on a visit to the central office for other publications.'

to the 'Blue Ribbon' movement, we cannot, in any way, retract the opinions which we expressed in regard to what we must hold to have been an unfortunate mistake. We are quite aware that in his pamphlet on the subject, mentioned by us on p. 467, Canon Ellison has laid down many conditions of co-operation with Dissenters in 'Gospel Temperance Missions' such as, if loyally carried out, would to some slight extent minimize the evils which we fear: but we have no hesitation in saying that the ultimate issue of this and similar combined religious movements must be the increase of indifference in the popular mind to principles which are regarded in the Prayer Book as of the first importance to the growth of the spiritual life; and the Executive Committee of a Society like the Church of England Temperance Society had no right, in its corporate capacity, to act so as to appear to commit the Society as a whole to so-called 'Gospel' teaching to which, in many quarters, the most serious objections are conscientiously entertained. But here, again, we believe that the true remedy is for decided Churchmen to join, as we expressed a hope they would do, in direct Temperance work, and we are glad to note that the *Chronicle* has recently reprinted the following admirable remarks from a sermon preached in the United States by the Bishop of Rochester, we hope and believe as an earnest of a more Church-like line for the future:—

'As to wine, it is the "creature of God," and nothing should prevent us from this testimony, while we find it in His Holy Word deliberately classed by the inspired Songman with His other indisputable gifts of bread and oil; when we remember that our Holy Saviour, pattern and righteousness of His people, not only partook of it Himself, but publicly multiplied it for the use of others; while further we use and accept the language of the Common Prayer Book in the most solemn of her services, where she reverently enjoins it to be consecrated for the use of the saints. I, for one, have no sympathy with those who frown on the temperate use of it; who curtly dogmatize on the physical value of it; who denounce the sellers of it as deliberate manufacturers of wickedness; who hold that the sole remedy for the patent and woeful abuse of it is the Total Abstaining from it by all Christian men. If, as I believe it to be, one great function of the Episcopal Church in this land is to guide, and steady, and regulate, the manifold religious activities in our midst, it is the conspicuous merit and unique claim of this Episcopal Church Temperance Society that her constitution deliberately associates, and on equal terms, for her noble and beneficent work, those who altogether abstain from the use of alcohol and those who, in moderation, partake of it. For it is not only the intemperate who need to be reformed, but the temperate, yet thoughtless, who

need to be instructed and cautioned. . . . But this cannot be done—among those, at least, who are best worth winning and using—by intemperate jargon, or inflated exaggeration, or moral platitudes, still less by rosettes and tea-parties. It is to be effected only by solid argumentation that will bear thinking about next morning, and by calm but kindly persuasiveness by those who, while they properly decline to listen to the fiery advocate who puts a pistol to their heads bidding them stand and deliver, are willing enough, for Christ's sake, to yield to what the judgment of conscience whispers to them, when they see that there is reason behind it.'

We can assure the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society that so long as they act in the spirit of these words, and of their Chairman's own pamphlet, issued some years since, *Parochial Temperance Work as part of the Cure of Souls*, they may always count upon the cordial goodwill of those Churchmen on whose behalf we write.

III. We add, in conclusion, a few remarks meant, not for Dr. N. Kerr, but for any clergyman who may have felt some uneasiness in consequence of the controversy in regard to the use of wine, in the ordinary accepted sense of the term, in Holy Communion.

In our recent article we endeavoured to show that the only kind of wine mentioned in the New Testament was fermented and intoxicating; that there is the highest moral certainty that Our Lord used such wine in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, because there is no reason for doubting, but, on the contrary, every reason for supposing from His general conformity to established usage, that He would have followed the usual custom; that this certainty is confirmed by the practice of the Apostolic Church as indicated by the events at Corinth and by the clear testimony of the sub-Apostolic and Primitive Fathers; and, finally, that in no age or part of the Church Catholic has any other element than fermented wine in the ordinary acceptation of the term been allowed, except when it was *impossible* to procure such wine. In regard to each and all of these positions we have in our own mind no doubt at all, and although we are perfectly aware that the physical constituents and chemical properties of the bread and wine are not affected by consecration, we still hold that in the faithful use of the Sacrament administered with those elements which 'the Lord hath commanded to be received,' the Redeemer will shield all who worthily communicate from every possible harm. It is not, then, in order to strengthen arguments which, as every competent Biblical and liturgical scholar knows are unanswerable, but merely to

show that we do not speak without adequate authority, that we now subjoin a few testimonies offered by men whose knowledge of the subject is indisputable.

(A) *Passover Wine*. The position of the authors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary*, that the fermented juice of the grape was included in the prohibition of ferment, is given up by Dr. Kerr. 'The evidence,' however, 'seems to him conclusive that by the Jews unfermented unintoxicating wine had been as fully allowed' (*Passover Wine*, p. 18). In order to support this view, he appealed to the Delegate Chief Rabbi, Dr. H. Adler, who addressed to him the following note :—

[Copy]

'Office of the Chief Rabbi,
' 16 Finsbury Square,
' London, Jan. 10th, 1883.

'MY DEAR DR. KERR,—I have read with much interest the report on raisin wine, which you were good enough to send me.

'In reply to your question I beg to state that during the Passover Festival the use of fermented and unfermented wine is equally lawful, whether prepared from the grape or from raisin; but the greatest possible care must be used that there be no admixture of any juice or other substance prepared from corn or grain, whether beer or spirit.

'With kind regards, yours very faithfully,
' (Signed) H. ADLER.'

The Delegate Chief Rabbi also attended the meeting, on February 20, at which the lecture entitled 'Passover Wine' was delivered, and gave an address upon the subject, prefacing his remarks by the following statement :—'I confess that I labour under a certain amount of difficulty in referring to the subject, as I have not read the article in the *Church Quarterly*.' We expected that this address would have formed an appendix to Dr. Kerr's lecture, but, as it does not appear there, we must rely upon the report in the *Temperance Record* of February 22, 1883. In this address, then, Dr. H. Adler informs us that

(1) 'The fact is beyond dispute that wine, fermented grape, is not prohibited on the Passover, and the best proof of this matter is given from the *Talmud*.'

(2) 'It was the custom in those days that wine was never partaken of until it had been previously mixed with water, and even the preparation is given in various parts of the *Talmud*.'

(3) 'It is by no means necessary that this wine should have been fermented. Raisin wine was *permissible*, and is still used largely at the present day for reasons of economy.'

(4) 'There are interesting passages in the *Talmud* which earnestly exhort to temperance and denounce intoxication.'¹

All the support, then, given by Dr. H. Adler to persons who, like the Dean of Carlisle, 1861 (*Wines &c.*, p. 110), have no doubt whatever that the cup Our Lord blessed, when He instituted the Holy Supper, was a cup of unfermented wine, is that, in ancient times, 'raisin wine was permissible, and is still largely used for reasons of economy.' The learned Doctor has in effect said very little more than we said ourselves on p. 454, but we venture respectfully to inform him that even this slight admission, so far as the practice of antiquity is concerned, would not be made by authorities whose weight he would, we suppose, acknowledge. Dr. N. Adler is quite distinct in his statement that 'from the notices in the *Talmud* it is apparent that the wine was *invariably* mixed with water, so as to prevent its having an intoxicating effect.'² In regard to present usage, Dr. Littledale permits us to state that he 'has been informed by perhaps the most learned Rabbi in England, that great care is taken to preserve the Passover wine from all *extraneous* fermentation, but not from *natural* fermentation, inasmuch that *rum* is allowed where wine cannot be had.'

After his address, Dr. H. Adler stated, in answer to a question, that 'the Founder of Christianity, having been a Jew, must have used on the Passover unleavened bread, and either fermented or unfermented wine, the former diluted with water.'

We applied to Dr. Edersheim for information as to the value of this statement, and are allowed to print his reply:—

'Leaving entirely aside the question of the present *use* (which for several reasons is *not* authoritative as to the past, nor determines what it was), I do not know to what passage in the *Talmud* Dr. Adler refers when he says that Our Lord *may* have used either fermented or unfermented wine. The *Fer. Talmud* only speaks, besides ordinary mixed wine, of spiced wine; of wine to which a much larger than the ordinary proportion of water is added, provided only the colour and taste of wine are retained; of boiled wine (*Fer. Pes.* 37 *ā*);

¹ Dr. Kerr also cites the testimony of Professor Marks, the head of the Reformed Jewish Church. He states in effect that in that body unfermented wine, prepared from fresh grapes or raisins, is lawful at the Passover. His testimony, however, is valueless in the consideration of the question whether or not unfermented wine was used in Our Lord's day. Dr. Kalisch has said, 'It is unnecessary to speak of Reform (*sic*) Jews, and still less of the Rationalistic Jews, who are Jews only in name and by descent' (quoted by 'Sollicitus,' *Guardian*, September 20, 1882).

² See his letter quoted in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1883, p. 454.

though it also mentions dried up wine.' 'For my own part I think there can be no reasonable doubt that, according to the general practice, Our Lord and His Apostles on that ever-memorable occasion used the ordinary red wine of the country mixed with water.'

The Rev. S. C. Malan, Vicar of Broadwindsor, in his work on *The Two Holy Sacraments* (p. 119), remarks: 'Likewise was the cup of wine called פרי הגפן, γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου, "the fruit of the vine," and the best to be had, if possible red,¹ if not, white, also blessed at the beginning of the supper.' While Mr. Malan, whose acquaintance with Jewish customs is well known, thinks it probable that Our Lord at the Last Supper blessed and drank pure wine, he has no doubt that the wine was fermented. 'He must have drunk,' he has written to us, 'either *new* or *old* wine. If *new* of the preceding vintage in September, it must have been fermented (Acts ii. 13) only a few weeks later. If *old*, the wine was, of course, fermented.'²

Unfermented wine, then, at the Passover, if anciently used at all, which is extremely doubtful, was employed only in case of scarcity or for economical reasons. The use of fermented wine was clearly general, and where is there the slightest evidence that the wine which Our Lord blessed and drank was any other?

(B) *Church Usage.* No one can seriously pretend that there is any real evidence to show that the Church in the first five centuries ever used aught else in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist than wine mixed with water. We showed in our article that 'The Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew,' and the 'Julian Decree' are worthless; the former is heretical, and the latter spurious. On the part of heretics and schismatics during this period there is no doubt a great deal of affirmative evidence in favour of the use either of grape-juice or water, but we can hardly suppose that 'clergymen of the Church of England who are anxious to follow the exact actions of Our Blessed Lord' in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist would prefer the guidance of 'Bishop Plato,' the Encratites, Marcionites, Hydroparastatæ, and Manicheans, to that of Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, S. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, S. Ambrose (*De Sacram.*,

¹ 'I may allude to the fact that red wine was used by preference. It was considered symbolical of joy' (Dr. H. Adler, *The Temperance Record*, February 22, 1883).

² We would refer our readers to Mr. Malan's elaborate note 'On the Wine used in the Holy Eucharist' in his work on *The Two Holy Sacraments*, pp. 259-263.

lib. v. cap. 1), the Apostolic Constitutions, and the early liturgies.¹ For ourselves we prefer to be on the side of the orthodox rather than on the side of the schismatics.

In order to make our readers quite certain of the present practice of the Oriental Church we applied for information to the Archimandrite Hieronymus Myriantheus of the Greek Church, S. Sophia, Moscow Road, Bayswater. His reply is quite decisive.

'The holy Eastern Church uses always and everywhere in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist fermented wine, and never unfermented wine. When the priest puts the wine in the chalice he puts also a little water, saying the verse 34, c. 19, of S. John's Gospel. I know,' he adds, 'only by the history that the Abyssinians used wine made from raisins because they had not true wine.'

In this connexion we do not forget that the Copts, like the Abyssinians, have been obliged to use, at times, wine made of raisins with water, instead of the genuine fruit of the vine. The true explanation of the incident is given by Neale in the subjoined extract:—

'The émir (Mutewakel) seemed determined . . . that the Holy Eucharist should not be celebrated at all. To carry the latter prohibition into the more complete effect, he also forbade, under pretext of extraordinary veneration for the Mahometan law, the buying or selling of wine throughout Egypt, but more especially in Cairo; and so vigilant was the care exercised in the carrying out of the edict that wine was by no means to be procured. In this extremity, the Christians bruised raisins in water, and used the expressed juice to celebrate the Holy Eucharist. A question arose whether the Sacrament thus, in case of necessity, administered with unfermented liquor could be considered valid. Many Canonists denied its validity. Even Egyptian writers do not venture to defend it. So Michael, Bishop of Melicha or Nicopolis, a divine of eminence among the Jacobites, though his age is uncertain, decides that it is not to be allowed.'²

¹ Dr. Littledale has kindly informed us that 'no historical Church, except the Armenian, omits the mixture of water (in itself a proof of fermentation), and that Church is charged, when the practice first arose, with sanctioning the omission in the interest of Monophysitism. It is certain that the original Armenian liturgy must have had the mixture, because S. Gregory the Illuminator, Apostle of Armenia, came from a Church where the use of the mixed cup is not disputed.' Mr. Malan (on *The Two Holy Sacraments*, p. 269) mentions that the Jacobite Syrians, who are Monophysites, use the unmixed cup.

² *Hist. Patr. Alex.*, vol. ii. p. 156. Renaudot, *Oriental Liturgies*, tom. I., p. 193 ff., after discussing this case, and a quotation from Barsalibi, concludes that the use of this grape juice was only allowed 'in extreme necessity,' i.e. when it was impossible to procure ordinary wine, and prohibited as a general rule. Among the Christians of S. Thomas, over

TH
attem
do no
cases,
those
and t
ensur
prove
been
usage
bratin
the F
Euch
day, a
as at
attem
nary c
local
the st
have a
mustu
cured,
Canon
adding
cogniz
defect
author
use un
TH
suppli

'It
Christi
wine in
grape;
can be

whom
implyin
Christi
257, 29
seems t
probabl
parts of
1 'N
position
suffici
those c

The fact is that in citing these exceptional instances to attempt to prove their point the advocates of this innovation do not understand what they have to make clear. All the cases, whether Eastern or Western, cited on their side, are those of the impossibility of procuring *certainly* valid matter, and the consequent licensing of *possibly* valid matter, to ensure the celebration somehow. But they have not as yet proved that, when valid matter is procurable, there ever has been licence for any other. The only sort of exception is the usage mentioned by some Western mediæval writers of celebrating the Mass with juice expressed from ripe grapes on the Festival of the Transfiguration. There is in the Greek Euchologion an office for the benediction of grapes upon this day, and the same usage obtained in many parts of France—as at Angers, Tours, Orleans, Auxerre, and Rouen. But to attempt to justify the use of unfermented wine in the ordinary celebration of the Holy Eucharist on the strength of a local French custom observed only once a year simply shows the straits to which Dr. Kerr and his friends are driven. We have already shown that S. Thomas Aquinas plainly says that *mustum* is only permissible where *vinum vitis* cannot be procured, or *in necessitate*, and we have the high authority of Canon Bright, kindly given in a private communication, for adding that, in his opinion, S. Thomas 'would not have recognized any "*necessitas*" except that created by the actual defect of wine commonly so called, and, therefore, that his authority cannot be utilized to cover a Teetotalist proposal to use unfermented grape juice in England.'¹

The judgment of the Roman Church has been courteously supplied to us by Bishop Ullathorne.

'It is,' he says, 'of the Catholic faith that Christ instituted the Christian sacrifice and sacrament in bread and wine, and that the wine in which He instituted the Divine ordinance was the juice of the grape; consequently that no other element but the juice of the grape can be used.'

whom Barsalibi presided as Metropolitan of Amid, the mixed chalice, implying the use of fermented wine, was and is the rule. (See *The Christians of S. Thomas and their Liturgies*, by G. B. Howard, pp. 257, 295, 322, &c.) The use of grape-juice, without plea of necessity, seems to have been confined to the Ethiopians, and even this is not improbably due to Manichean influences, which were strong in different parts of Africa.

¹ 'Nothing,' Canon Bright adds, 'can better illustrate S. Thomas's position as to "*necessitas*" than what he says to the effect that real wine, sufficient in quantity for the purpose of the Sacrament, may be carried to those countries in which wines do not grow.'

After alluding to S. Thomas, the Bishop proceeds :

'As to the quality of the wine I may quote the general Rubrics of the Roman Missal, authorized by the Pontiffs, and laws of universal obligation. "IV. De Defectu Vini. 1. Si vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis seu non maturis expressum, vel ei admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur sacramentum. 2. Si vinum cœpit acescere, vel corrumpi, *vel de uvis tunc expressum*, vel non fuerit admixta aqua, vel fuerit admixta aqua rosacea, seu alterius distillationis, conficitur sacramentum, sed conficiens graviter peccat." This includes what S. Thomas says, that "mustum habet speciem vini, sed prohibetur." And from these sentences you will see what is invalid, and what is valid but unlawful.'

As Dr. Kerr has produced 'a new witness,' F. Burmann A.D. 1688, one of 'many additional testimonies he could bring forward in proof of the position that fermented intoxicating wine was not the only recognized lawful sacramental element,' we thought it desirable to ask Bishop Ullathorne whether he had reason to suppose that Popes have ever permitted, as Canon Hopkins informs us, the use of milk when wine could not be procured. We quote his reply :—

'I first make the answer that the proposition sounds absurd and ridiculous in Catholic ears. A Pope has no power to change the *materia* of the Sacrament as instituted by Christ, which is bread and wine of the grape, which is the only classical sense of the word *vinum*. What the Popes could not do, they never have done. But the Fourth Concilium Bracarense of the year 675, in its second canon, quotes a decree of Pope Julius I., condemning certain Egyptians for using milk in place of wine in the Eucharistical celebration. It is also quoted in the Decretum Gratiani, but that collection has never been authorized, and the authority for the letter of Julius I. is the citation of the Council of Braga.'¹

For believing that the unfermented fluids prepared either by the application of enormous heat, and still more of salicylic acid, are not in any true sense wine, we have an authority whose name, if mentioned, would carry very considerable weight.² 'There can,' he writes, 'in my opinion as a chemist, be no wine unless it be a fermented liquor.' But, perhaps, some even of Dr. Kerr's audience at the lecture on Passover Wine may have been a little shaken by the following candid admission :—

¹ The Bishop of course regards the decree as genuine, but the force of his general reply is not thereby weakened.

² We simply withhold the name because our correspondent tells us that 'time will not allow him to enter into the matter controversially.'

'Nor is it remarkable that the clerical field of vision should have been so contracted when we see a similar limitation in scientific volumes. Take, for example, the most recent of my friend Dr. Wynter Blyth's books, *The Chemistry of Foods*. You will find in that learned and most interesting work, a work of great value and practical usefulness, a definition of wine as the fermented juice of the grape, and a vast amount of reliable information about fermented wine. The existence of unfermented wine is, on the other hand, completely ignored' (p. 21).¹

If the 'unfermented wines' used for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in some churches are not wines, then these are invalid matter. If, which we do not believe, they are in some sense wines, still, being unfermented, they are altogether unlawful in a country where real wine can be readily procured; their sanction by authority would expose us to the well-deserved ridicule of all other branches of the Church Catholic, and open serious questions as to the regularity of our own Eucharistic celebrations.

(C) *Appeal on behalf of reformed inebriates*. We have consulted on this subject one of the most eminent of living surgeons. He writes as follows:—

'March 10, 1883.

'MY DEAR—, —I have never seen or heard of any cases in support of the statements which you showed me, and I do not believe that there are any.

'As to the risk that the wine of the Holy Communion may lead the children of dipsomaniacs to the insane practices of their parents, it seems clear that there would be equal risk in entrusting the children of suicidal maniacs with pocket-knives or guns, or any means of self-destruction. Similarly the children of those who steal insanely should not go into shops. If any of the risks were real or appreciable they might be proved by many instances; but I believe that there are none; and certainly they have never been enough to suggest to any reasonable person that all the children of insane people should be shut out from the subjects of their parents' insanity.

'Nearly the same may be said concerning the pretended risk that the Communion wine may induce a relapse in a cured or reformed dipsomaniac. The same risk should forbid anyone who has ever attempted suicide from again handling a knife, or a pistol,

¹ On p. 30 Dr. Kerr admits that 'unfermented wine, unless an antiseptic be added, will not keep many days after the opening of the bottle.' This confirms our view that there is no such thing. 'Long ago,' a very eminent dignitary writes to us, 'some one showed me some such substance, and I said, "Why is it tightly corked up?" "Because," said my friend, "it would ferment." I replied, "Then it would become wine. Is not nature against you if that be so?"' So Dr. Andrew Ure defines 'wine' as 'the fermented juice of the grape.'

VOL. XVI.—NO. XXXI. Q

or a rope; or anyone who in madness or even mere recklessness has ever done a mischief from ever again being in the opportunity of doing the like. If any of the risks were appreciable the instances in evidence of them would be many and easily adduced. They are, in fact, so few that it would be deemed very unreasonable if, in order to put an end to the risks anyone were to suggest a change in any of even the most ordinary habits of common life.'

Now, premising that we do not cast the slightest doubt upon Dr. Kerr's sincerity, let us enumerate Dr. Kerr's instances of 'relapses through Sacramental wine.'

(1) The case mentioned in *Wines &c.*, pp. 123-125, and discussed in our article, pp. 464-5. Dr. Kerr states that he had permission to disclose the name of his *informant* to the late Primate. He would not appear, then, to have had any personal knowledge of the case.

(2) At the lecture on 'Passover Wine,' Surgeon-General C. R. Francis 'attended to relate the history of a recent very remarkable occurrence in a cathedral city, showing the danger to a believing reformed inebriate from an intoxicating cup, even on so solemn an occasion.' In a note, we are informed that 'this case is well known to a Christian worker with whom the Primate is personally acquainted.'

(3) 'Other instances,' says Dr. Kerr, 'are known to me.' He does not mention them, but prefers to present us with the story of a colonel in the Army of the United States (on the authority of 'the eloquent and earnest John B. Gough') who is reported to have fallen and died 'through partaking of intoxicating wine at the Lord's Table.'

(4) Dr. Kerr 'is authorized to disclose to the archbishops the name of a distinguished and learned professor, a non-abstainer, for confirmation of the truth of the relapse of a gentleman, who for years had communicated in unfermented wine at his own church, through a sacramental intoxicant.'

(5) Dr. Kerr states that he refuses 'to allow any of his reformed inebriate patients to communicate in those intoxicating wines in which lurks his inveterate foe.' In *Wines &c.*, we learn that 'in this practice Dr. Kerr is supported by Dr. Richardson, Dr. Fergus, Surgeon-General Francis, and other experts in the higher ranks of the medical profession.' We may observe, without offence, that the measure of support is not very large. On the specific instances of relapses we think no comment is needed.

We have no intention of following Dr. Kerr into his remarks on 'the sphere of grace.' We know perfectly well what the scope of the operation of Divine grace is, but we

also
He
acce
sign
'He
eter
vi. 5.
recei
impu
to tr
men
TI
have
desc
regar
that,
when
some
which
issue
of th

'
who
that
not o
by sc
love,

T
'
sense
exces
who,
act an
matte
and th
practi
intent
ninet

¹ Jer

also know that, while grace cannot repair a physical defect, He Who in His omniscience chose wine in the ordinary accepted use of the term to be with bread 'the outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace,' said of this Sacrament, 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day' (S. John vi. 54). We know also that among the first converts who so received the Eucharist there were men who had been both impure and intemperate (1 Cor. vi. 10), and we shall continue to trust the Redeemer in His own ordinances without supplementing His command by human provisions.

The *Jewish World*, which the advocates of this innovation have thought it fitting to press into their service, although it describes the Sacramental wine as 'the seductive brew'¹ regards the question as absolutely infinitesimal. We suppose that, as the verdict of that journal has been quoted in quarters where better things might reasonably have been expected, some Churchmen think so too. The following extracts, with which we leave the subject, may perhaps show them that the issues of this innovation upon the ancient and general custom of the Church Catholic are not so trifling as they suppose:—

'They say, indeed,' the Bishop of Lincoln has written; 'that we who use fermented wine in the Holy Communion may be right, but that they who use unfermented wine cannot be wrong; as if it were not one of the most wrong things in the world to distract the Church by schism, and to make the Holy Communion, which is the feast of love, to become an occasion of strife.'²

The Bishop of Bedford speaks even more seriously:

'That our Blessed Lord used real wine, wine in the ordinary sense of the word, wine such as was capable of being abused by excess, I see no possibility of doubting, and I cannot excuse those who, in the excess of their zeal, incur the peril of condemning the very act and injunction of the Son of God Himself. Their position in the matter has been implicitly condemned by the Church long ages ago, and the plain and obvious sense of Holy Scripture, supported by the practice of the universal Church, is not to be thrust aside by the well-intentioned, but presumptuous, assumptions of enthusiasts of the nineteenth century.'³

¹ *Jewish World*, Feb. 23, 1883. ² *Diocesan Addresses*, A.D. 1876, p. 48.

³ Sermon at S. Paul's, May 2, 1881.

SHORT NOTICES.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of James and John. By JOHN EDWARD HUTHER, Th.D., Pastor at Wittenförden, Schwerin. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882).

THIS volume, with that on the Epistle to the Hebrews, next to be mentioned, is issued by the publisher uniformly with the volumes of Meyer's *Commentary on the New Testament*, and by way of completing that series where it had been left imperfect by Dr. Meyer. With them, as we learn, the Meyer *Commentary* is complete; and assuredly, however we should venture to differ in not a few particulars from the views on various points expressed in it, we cannot but recognize it as a very valuable one. Dr. Meyer has taken up a crotchety here and there, as, for example, in that curious notion that the group of epistles comprising those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written from Cæsarea, and not, as is commonly believed, from Rome. But usually his mind is wonderfully pellucid and fair, and, so far as we have seen, he never avoids an exegetical difficulty, but frankly states and does his best to solve it. It would be going too far, perhaps, to call him *conservative*, according to the English standard; but according to the German standard he is marked by orthodoxy, and observant of the ancient views which so many of his compatriots altogether disregard. And we do not know *any* German commentary which, upon the whole, we can so unreservedly commend as this.

Dr. Huther's edition of the Epistles of S. James and S. John has something of the same good qualities, though we do not know that it is equal to Meyer's own work. There seems to us to be sometimes a degree of rashness and want of consideration in his comments. This is particularly evident in the introduction to the (first) Epistle. While he rightly attributes it to the pen of S. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, called the brother of our Lord, he hesitates to identify him with the son of Alphæus (= Clopas), and insists in a particularly rash and violent way upon the truth of the Helvidian hypothesis that the ἀδελφοὶ Ἰησοῦ were 'the children of Mary born in wedlock with Joseph after the birth of Jesus' (p. 7). The conclusive argument for the identity of the two derived from S. Paul's express assertion in Gal. i. 19 he sets aside in a very arbitrary way and without solid reason. He does not appear to appreciate the great improbability that there should be two families in each of which there were four sons, and that the cousins in each family should be severally called James, Josès, Jude, and Simon. And whereas most of the critics who hold a similar view do so while allowing the difficulty of it, Dr. Huther

can see no difficulty. He even goes further than other writers who agree with him, and adduces S. Matt. i. 25 and S. Luke ii. 7 as a proof of the irreverent Helvidian view, which is not often done of late. It is arbitrary to say, as Dr. Huther does, that 'if it were otherwise there would be some intimation in the New Testament that Joseph was a widower when he married Mary' (p. 7). Such a remark ignores the essentially *incomplete* and even fragmentary character of the Gospels, considered as a history; for how many material facts are left in doubt in them, e.g. the descent of S. Mary, the precise year of our Lord's birth, the number of the Passovers over which His ministry extended, the day on which His death took place, and the exact facts respecting His burial and resurrection! And this makes an argument *a silentio* more than precarious.

The character of this dissertation at the outset does not increase our approval of the book. But we have no specific fault to find with the notes on critical and grammatical points, which are generally satisfactory.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

By DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. (Edinburgh, 1882.)

WHEN we find on the first page of a commentary, as in this, the opening statement that 'the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of an unknown writer,' we know pretty well what to expect from the commentator. But we could hardly have anticipated the precise conclusion which he has reached upon this subject, and it appears to us the most unlikely possible on a subject which has been fruitful in wild hypothesis. Dr. Lünemann is indeed in one sense (unintentionally) consistent with himself, since he decides for the authorship of Apollos, who is assuredly '*an unknown writer*' to him and everyone else. He seems to us to attenuate unduly the force of the testimonies which ascribe the Epistle to S. Paul, and, in fact, he approaches the question too much in the spirit of a controversialist. There is much exactness and justness of thought generally in the detailed annotations upon the text—e.g. on xiii. 11, 'We have an altar.' He follows rightly (in our opinion) the opinion of S. Thomas Aquinas, Estius, with Alford and others, that by it is to be understood 'the Cross of Christ,' on which the sacrifice of the new covenant is offered. It is true that S. Thomas adds 'or Christ Himself,' a fact which Dr. Lünemann does not mention in deciding (as he does) against that opinion. But in negating strongly that view which explains the phrase 'of the table of the supper,' the *τράπεζα Κυρίου*, which is the explanation given by Cornelius à Lapide and many other writers, he does not seem to realize how the second of these two conceptions blends with the former one; so that the 'altar' which Christians have may very well have been the Cross of Christ, *formally and causally*, and yet, at the same time, the sacrament of the Eucharist, may be mediately and indirectly contemplated. But writers of Dr. Lünemann's school have but little regard for the *perspective* of thought in theology.

The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neo-Platonist. Translated from the original Greek, by JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., F.S.A. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

IN the preface to this translation Mr. Chambers gives some account of the legends concerning the person known as Mercurius or Hermes Trismegistus, who represented the learning and sacerdotal discipline of the Egyptians. Some Christian writers supposed him to be prior to the time of Moses, and that he was named 'thrice great Hermes' (Milton) from his threefold rank of philosopher, priest, and king. This Hermes was worshipped as a god by the ancient Egyptians.

The author of the *Poemandres* cannot, however, claim such high antiquity. Casaubon and others have shown that he was a Greek living at Alexandria, of later date than Philo.

There have been several editions of the *Poemandres* produced on the Continent, but the treatise has received but little notice in England. The Greek text and Latin and French translations have appeared from time to time. The *Poemandres* and the *Fragments* collected by Stobæus are ascribed to the same author; not so the other Hermaica, which are either of Egyptian heathenish origin (p. xvi) or belong to the later times of Plotinus and Jamblichus.

The style of the *Poemandres* is mystical and obscure. It follows the Platonic notions of God and the generation of the universe. The author was evidently acquainted with the Old Testament Scriptures, and the Book of Wisdom, and the writings of Philo. The first part takes the form of a dialogue between the philosopher and the Mind of the Supreme Power concerning the origin of things. The Archetypal Mind, which is male-female,¹ begets life and light, and then by the word or Logos becomes the cause or parent of the creative intelligence. Hence there are generated the seven administrators.

God is the First Cause of all. Man is the child of God, with a twofold nature. To the heavenly and Divine part of man there is ascribed will, immortality, and dominion; to the inferior part, which is material and moves in the region of sense, there is ascribed energy, mortality, and subjection to fate. Nature in man, as well as other things possessed of life, is originally male-female, but is subsequently separated into sexes.

There is an ascent of the soul of man out of the region of sense to seek its Divine Parent. The holy and good among men detest the senses; the sensual and carnal give themselves over to death instead of mounting upwards.

¹ ἀρσενόθελος. This may be compared with the doctrines of the Kabbala. See an article on Adolphe Franck's treatise, *Christian Remembrancer*, April 1862, p. 352: 'There are notices of a belief in a male and female principle as pervading the Deity. The shekinah is spoken of as female; and the three elements of water, air, and fire are "mothers." The system of emanation is Persian or Indian, but the idea of the male and female principle was borrowed from the Egyptian mysteries.'

The distinctive attribute of God most dwelt upon is His paternity. He is also the Cause of all, and the only good. The souls that partake of the gift of God elevate themselves above the bodily pleasures, and hasten to the One and Only, considering their sojourn here as a misfortune. Hence asceticism is praised, such as was practised by the Essenes, according to Josephus, and is ascribed by some to the author of the Book of Wisdom when he speaks of the corruptible body pressing down the soul. 'The garment which thou bearest is a web of ignorance, the support of wickedness, the bond of corruption, the dark enclosure, the living death, the sentient corpse, the tomb carried about with thee, the domestic robber, who hates through the things he loves and grudges through the things he hates' (p. 46). With this the translator compares some expressions of William Law in his *Spirit of Prayer*. 'Our own life is to be hated, and the reason is plain: it is because there is nothing lovely in it. It is a legion of evil, a monstrous birth of the serpent, the world, and the flesh. It is an apostasy from the life and power of God in the soul; a life that is death to heaven, that is pure unmixed idolatry, that lives wholly to self and not to God; and therefore all this own life is to be hated, all this self is to be denied and mortified, if the nature, spirit, tempers, and inclinations of Christ are to be brought to life in us.'

On the other hand paternity is declared to be so Divine and essential to happiness and completeness that it is the greatest misfortune and irreligion that anyone should depart childless from among men. This assertion comes as a strange episode in a Platonic treatise, and is in direct contradiction of the teaching of the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, especially Eccclus. xvi. 1-3. The author, however, quotes Wisdom, as in v. 5: 'I wish it were possible for thee, becoming winged, to fly up into the air, and being lifted up in the midst between the earth and heaven, to behold the solidity of the earth and the fluidity of the sea, the flowings of rivers, the looseness of the air, the vehemence of fire, the course of stars, the very swift circling of heaven around these.' This, with the passage which follows, is an expansion of Wisdom vii. 17-19, where wisdom is said to include the whole circle of knowledge, the perception of the 'things that exist.' In chapter x. there is another point of contact with wisdom. 'Hast thou not heard in the Generics that from the one Soul of the universe all souls proceed, which are rolled about as if distributed in all the world?' as in Wisdom the Divine Sophia is said to 'go through all understanding, pure and most subtil spirits.' Impious souls suffer the flames of their own impiety, but it is an error to suppose that they enter into wild beasts. The heavenly bodies, and all things that have motion, are regarded as animated by a soul (p. 71). Life is the union of mind and soul. Death is not the destruction of the compounds, but the dissolution of the union (p. 73).

The translation is followed by an appendix, consisting of a few extracts from the Fathers which contain notices of Hermes or quotations from his writings. Amongst these are extracts from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Augustine.

The writers who made most use of Hermes were Lactantius and Cyril of Alexandria. Among English divines William Law was the most attracted by his mysticism, as he was at another time by the strange fancies of Jacob Boehmen. In his *Appeal to all that doubt the Truths of the Gospel* he says, 'It has been an opinion commonly received, without any foundation in the light of nature or Scripture, that God created the whole visible world, and all things in it, out of nothing. Nay, that the souls of men and the highest orders of beings were created in the same manner. The Scripture is very decisive against this original of the souls of men. For the soul came forth as a breath of life out of the mouth of God. It is no more a part or prerogative of God's omnipotence to create a being out of nothing than to make a thing to be without any quality of being in it,' &c. The Platonic notion that the world was generated rather than created is prominent throughout Hermes.

The translation appears to be careful and accurate, and the reader is much helped by the Greek of the more obscure words being given in foot notes. In some places it is needlessly bald and literal, but the translator has brought together a good deal of curious matter in illustration of his difficult and somewhat unattractive subject.

A Religious Encyclopædia; or, Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. Based on the *Real-Encyclopædie* of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Volume I. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1883.)

HERZOG'S *Real-Encyclopædie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche* was begun as long ago as 1854, nearly thirty years ago, and in those days was a good deal sought after, being then almost the only representative of a very useful class of work, from which much information might be gained, particularly upon the subjects of critico-philosophical thought and Biblical criticism. It long remained almost without a rival in these respects, for such inquirers, at all events, as were able to read German; and if an English edition of it, under adequate English editorship, had been issued fifteen or even ten years ago, it would have had the field to itself. But since then Smith's *Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities* and *Christian Biography* have appeared, a series in some respects unrivalled in excellence; and so we cannot tell what the probabilities of success of this edition may be. They would, however, we should imagine, be the better for a somewhat closer adaptation to English literary standards on the part of the editors. The number of headings is indeed enormously large; but very many of the articles are so brief as not to answer any purpose beyond directing the inquirer to some other book. What can be the intention of a life of 'Antoninus Pius' in twenty lines (we should have chosen to give his full name, 'T. Ælius Hadrianus Antoninus,' at least once in a biographical article; but we are perhaps pedantic and old-fashioned in our ideas of the necessity to be accurate, at all events in an encyclopædia), or of Pope Agatho in nineteen,

of B
shou
'Ch
half
to a
pers
add
cycl
that
how
acco
But
and
Suc
Eng
scri
Am
Can
the
ped
a ve

cert
mar
to
'Ai
with
(! l
line
garr
line
ther
New
spir
unto
pray
exor

A J

TH
Con
foun
the
vari
(Ec
ced
Eas

of Basilides in thirty-four, of Domitian in thirty-seven? Such articles should either be excised altogether or made adequate. Again, 'Chaucer' only occupies a column, 'Charlemagne' a column and a half, while 'Channing' has nearly double this length. This seems to argue a somewhat peculiar estimate of the relative importance of persons. To compensate this want of fulness in detail it must be added that the articles cover a much wider range than is usual in a cyclopædia of religion, and that its comprehensiveness approaches that of a general or universal cyclopædia. In adopting this line, however, it seems to us that more is attempted than can possibly be accomplished within the limits apparently marked out for the work. But there are, of course, many good and able articles, well conceived, and sufficient in length for a satisfactory unfolding of their subject. Such are 'Agnosticism,' 'Church History,' 'Congregationalism in England and in the United States' (two articles), 'Cuneiform Inscriptions,' 'College,' curiously enough, is wholly occupied with American institutions, and has nothing to say about Oxford and Cambridge and other institutions on this side of the water. In fact, the work so far seems intended to be the beginning of an encyclopædia which shall take as its special department things American—a very laudable purpose, which may eventually bear good fruit.

To our English eyes many *little* things seem amiss. There is a certain crudeness of expression, arising no doubt from the fact that many of the articles are translations from the German. It is odd to find 'apocryphical' for 'apocryphal' (p. 14), 'Aimon' for 'Aimoin' (p. 10); 'God must lessen His pace if He would keep step with man' (!!) (p. 20); and again, 'in token of the Lord's sincerity' (!!) (p. 16). The brief article on 'Absolution' (it is only thirty lines) is rather inexact. 'Chasuble' is defined as 'an ecclesiastical garment.' The article 'Clergy' is drawn on the extremest Protestant lines, and begins with the words, 'It may be considered settled that there is no order of clergy, in the modern sense of the term, in the New Testament; *i.e.* there is no class of men mentioned to whom spiritual functions exclusively belonged. Every believer is a priest unto God. Every believer has as much right as anybody else to pray, to preach, to baptize, to administer Communion.' An alarming exordium indeed!

A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents. By the Right Rev. CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, D.D., Bishop of Rothenburg. Vol. III. A.D. 431 to A.D. 451. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1883.)

THIS third volume of the excellent English edition of Bishop Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* appears at a considerable interval, but will be found exceedingly interesting. Twenty years more important than the precise twenty which it covers have never passed even in the varied history of the Church. They comprehend the two great Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, with the preceding and following synods, of which there were several both in the East and West, which were occupied with the Nestorian and Eutybian

controversies, and with the bitter personal quarrels which inflamed the doctrinal questions. Great interest is given to Dr. Hefele's narrative by the care and particularity with which he follows the great councils from day to day and from session to session. At the same time it is not to be forgotten that he holds a standing brief for the interests of the Papacy. He invariably takes the lofty claims which the legates of the Popes were at all times commissioned to put forth as the simple expression of their rights, and every courteous word with which such claims were received as an express acknowledgment of their justice. The editor of these volumes has very rightly directed express attention to Bishop Hefele's persistent attempts to break the force of the 28th canon of Chalcedon. It is amusing to observe that he repeats the statement of the Ballerini that the Roman See has never expressly recognized that canon, even while his instincts of historical correctness induce him to add, 'This must, however, be limited by the fact that' the fourth Lateran Synod under Pope Innocent III., in 1215, *did* so recognize it—a very important limitation. It is indeed only on Ultramontane principles that the Pope can be thought to be superior to an unambiguous canon of an Œcumenical Council of undoubted orthodoxy, and Bishop Hefele has not usually been thought a very thoroughgoing Ultramontane. No doubt a diplomatic form of speech had its advantages.

We can recommend this work to any who may not know it as able, learned, and more comprehensive than any other of its kind.

A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines during the First Eight Centuries. Being a continuation of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, B.D., D.D. Vol. III. Hermogenes—Myensis. (London: John Murray, 1882.)

THIS is a substantial instalment of a really valuable work. In previous notices of the earlier volumes of the series we have several times expressed our high appreciation of the service rendered to the scholar, the student, and the divine in the publication of these Dictionaries; and we need therefore say little more on the general character of the series. The present volume is as good as its predecessors, and of a very similar character, though longer than any of them, containing as it does more than a thousand pages. It comprises, perhaps, an unusual number of important articles, marked by great ability and learning, and each of which is the fruit of sufficient research to have made a volume, instead of being compressed into an article, however lengthy. Such are Dr. Cazenove's monographs on the two Hilarys, him of Poitiers and his greater namesake at Tours; Dr. Swete's on the 'Doctrine of the Holy Ghost'; Mr. Gore on 'Leo the Great'; Dr. Salmon on 'Montanism' and 'Muratorian Fragment'; and especially Dr. Badger's valuable history (for it is nothing less) of 'Muhammad.' Very good also is Mr. J. H. Lupton's 'John of Damascus,' and especially praiseworthy for a *catalogue raisonné* of the works of the great Eastern

doctor. The author does not write as if he had examined the originals very closely for himself, but his article is probably the best account of them extant in the English language.

Mr. Mozley's 'Libanius' is generously appreciative of the pagan rhetorician and opponent of Christianity, a praise which we fear we cannot extend to the article on 'Hieronymus' (Jerome), the author of which can hardly be said to be very enthusiastic about his subject. Nevertheless he is careful and painstaking, and estimates S. Jerome very justly on literary grounds. It is strange that so great a writer should have laid himself open to the charge which his biographer makes with too much of truth. 'In theology, properly so called, he is weak.' Nevertheless his style is rugged and forcible, for which his biographer renders him due praise, adding that 'it is vivid, full of illustrations, with happy turns, such as 'lucus a non lucendo,' 'Ὀνὶ λύρα, 'fac de necessitate virtutem,' 'Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est.' And the assertion is perfectly accurate. But we cannot understand why, when instances of this 'sal Atticum' might be picked out of S. Jerome's writings by the score, the writer of the article should hit upon sayings for quotation which were not peculiar to S. Jerome at all, but which he employed as the mere conversational coin current in society.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit: the Ninth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By GEORGE SMEATON, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

A SATISFACTORY treatise on this subject has long been one of the chief desiderata of theological literature. Dr. Smeaton's book, good as it is in some respects, hardly professes to supply the want. It 'has taken shape . . . rather as a general survey of theology from the view-point of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit than as an exhaustive exposition of any single topic.' This diffusiveness is the primary fault of the volume before us. Whilst no branch of the great subject has been overlooked, none is quite adequately handled. This is partly due, no doubt, to the form in which the work is cast. But though a lecturer is not at liberty to overload his text with details, he may supplement it with extensive footnotes and appendices—a privilege which our author has not permitted himself to use. There are also minor defects of execution which detract from the value of this volume. The style wants crispness and variety; it presents an unbroken expanse of evenly balanced periods, into which one longs to interpolate occasional valleys or hills. And, with no prejudice against the use of theological terms in a professedly theological treatise, we fail to see that either the theology or the English is helped by such expressions as 'rejuvenating,' 'sopited,' 'rectoral display,' 'glozing seduction.' Nor should we have thought it necessary to characterize David as 'the subordinate under-king of a Divine theocracy.' Akin to the employment of ambitious language is the writer's habit of overstating his case, as when he says that in Heb. ix. 14 the Eternal Spirit 'can only mean' the Holy Ghost, or

that the conviction of righteousness 'must mean' the giving of convincing evidence of the doctrine of an imputed righteousness.

In his manner of handling the sacred text Prof. Smeaton is not always fortunate. 'The Lord God and His Spirit hath sent Me' (Isa. xlviii. 16) can hardly, without violence to the Hebrew and the LXX, be converted into 'The Lord God hath sent Me and His Spirit.' In S. John x. 35 Our Lord is far from representing 'the word of God and the Scripture as identical,' the former being in this place the Divine call which preceded and accompanied the writing of the sacred books. In 1 S. Peter iii. 18 it is surely precarious either to retain the received text against the authority of all the uncials, or to translate *πνεῦμα* in such a manner as to destroy the antithesis to the preceding *σῶσις*. And we must be permitted to express our surprise that a professor of exegetical theology should have supported an assertion of the plenary inspiration of the Apostles by appealing to 1 Thess. iv. 8, without intimating that the inference falls to the ground if the reading of all the critical editions (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*) is accepted.

A yet graver fault is the narrowness of the writer's theology, which, rigidly orthodox from a Presbyterian standpoint, is impatient of the fuller and profounder views of truths which are the heritage of the Catholic Church. Prof. Smeaton has read the Fathers and studied Church history, and when the verdict of the Ancient Church is at one with the Westminster Confession he accepts it cheerfully; but if the Fathers differ from Calvin and from the Puritan divines, so much the worse for the Fathers. We fear we must add that under similar circumstances the natural interpretation of Holy Scripture has to make way for one which is strained or impossible. Our author's *πρῶτον ψεύδος* is the theory of indefectible grace, and it is curious to observe how he manipulates passages which interfere with this favourite dogma. *E.g.* on S. John iii. 5 he writes (p. 170), 'The water to which the Lord refers certainly regenerates, and entitles those who receive it to enter the kingdom of God, from which no true member can ever be cast out again—which cannot be affirmed of baptism in every case. . . . The water referred to by our Lord in this connection was but the ceremonial expression for the cleansing of our persons by His own obedience or atoning sacrifice. . . . The water and the Spirit . . . are the two conjoined elements; in other words, the meritorious cause and the efficient cause.' Still more remarkable is his way of escape from 'the two difficult passages which involve the apostacy of some professing Christians after being made partakers of the Holy Ghost ([Heb.] vi. 4), and where the parties have done despite to the Spirit of grace (x. 29).' They are 'instances of men receiving only the supernatural gifts, not true grace.' And this although the persons in question had been 'once for all (*ἀπαξ*) enlightened,' and 'sanctified' by 'the Blood of the covenant'!

We must also take exception to our author's practice of representing at a disadvantage the position of his antagonists, whilst he exaggerates the excellences of his friends. Thus Archbishop Laud is condemned for having by his influence introduced and encouraged

Romis
read t
of the
writer
implied
identical
agrees
Christ
Spirit
inactiv
whole
statem
book
influen
the Sp

No
which
of Scri
Trinit
with a
and it
is of
reader
fresh,
Christ
work.
Smeat
offers
dispos
tianity

Of
the fu
and w
emula
wide
life.
Hook
whose
allusio
no m
perma
tendo
Holy

Confes

CONT
confe
until
the n

Roman practices in the English Church ; and on the same page we read that the 'platonian mind' of Howe 'soared to the contemplation of the beatific vision.' In the 'spirituality' of the Puritans the writer can 'find nothing false or unhealthy ;' their opponents, it is implied, regarded 'the Spirit's work . . . as merely coeval and identical with the rite of baptism.' 'Ritualism, Romish or Anglican, agrees in making the Church's action a substitute for the action of Christ and His Spirit . . . it entirely ignores the operation of the Spirit of God . . . it makes the ever-acting High Priest a mere inactive spectator, and is irrespective of the Spirit's grace . . . the whole transaction is lodged in other hands.' But such *ex parte* statements are perhaps no more than might have been expected in a book which opens with these amazing words : 'Except where Puritan influences are still at work, we may safely affirm that the doctrine of the Spirit is almost entirely ignored.'

Notwithstanding these blemishes there is much in this book which may be thankfully welcomed. It begins with a useful *catena* of Scriptural evidence ; it states the Catholic doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Deity and Procession of the Holy Ghost with a fulness and precision which generally leave little to be desired ; and it presents a historical survey of the doctrine of the Spirit which is of considerable interest and fairly complete. Here and there the reader will find suggestions which may strike him as happy and fresh, and we would call attention in particular to the remarks on Christian ethics viewed in the light of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying work. Upon the doctrine of the Procession, it may be added, Prof. Smeaton is entirely at one with the Western Church ; and whilst he offers no apology for the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed, he is disposed to attribute the comparative stagnation of Eastern Christianity to the loss of the truth which the interpolation represents.

On the whole we regard this book as a useful stepping-stone to the full and dispassionate treatment of a most important subject ; and we rise from its perusal with the hope that it may provoke to emulation some English Churchman of loving and reverent faith, wide reading, and deep sympathy with the mysteries of the spiritual life. A Church which has given birth to the theological works of Hooker and Pearson, Bull and Waterland, Newman and Pusey, and whose prayers, as Prof. Smeaton reminds us, are 'replete with allusions to the Spirit's work and mission,' seems to be qualified in no mean degree for the task of collecting into a comprehensive and permanent form all that the thought and the experience of Christendom have contributed to the exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

Confession and Absolution in the Bible. By the Rev. WARWICK ELWIN, M.A. (London : J. T. Hayes, 1883.)

CONTROVERSIES and differences of opinion on the value of private confession will, we suppose, never cease in the Church ; and certainly until they do books on the subject will continue to be written. To the number of these Mr. Elwin has added one that has the merit of

taking a line which seems to have been strangely neglected. His work 'is intended to differ from other treatises on the subject chiefly in a more definite recognition of the historical development of penance by revelation, and in a fuller and more connected study of its evidences in the successive books of the Bible.' Accordingly the bulk of the book is devoted to an examination of Holy Scripture; and the thoroughness and candour with which the investigation of what is really taught on the subject in God's written word is conducted deserve the highest praise, and will, we cannot doubt, be found most helpful in dispelling prejudices and bringing home to the minds of many the need of *definiteness* in their repentance. There is so much ignorance and vagueness on this point, springing, we fear, sometimes from loose and random treatment by the clergy, that anything which may help to force upon men the need of *real* sorrow for sin, and of *real* confession of it, cannot afford to be neglected; and consequently we are truly grateful to Mr. Elwin for his well-timed essay.

The following passage will indicate the method of the book, and the manner in which the endeavour is made to bring out the continuity and progressive character of the teaching of Scripture:—

'The Bible evidence to be examined naturally falls into four great eras, each marked by its own characteristic revelation and its advancing development of the doctrine. First, there was the Primeval, extending from the Fall to the Flood. Its characteristic teaching was the elementary principle of repentance in its threefold form, particular emphasis being laid upon the confession to God. Then came the Patriarchal, extending from the Flood to the time of Moses. In this period there was added the idea of human mediation and intercession, the germ of the sacerdotal ministry. Thirdly, there was the Mosaic period, covering all the time from the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai to the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Ritual confession and typical atonement by means of animal sacrifices were the special features of this important era. Lastly, there was the Christian epoch, comprising our Lord's own ministry upon earth and that of the Apostles to the close of the canon of Scripture. The great crowning revelation of the New Testament teaching upon repentance is the gift to the Church of an effective ministerial absolution. Thus, by a steady development, the doctrine of penance was brought to the final state in which it has become the heritage of the Christian Church, to administer to penitent sinners until her Lord comes again to ratify and complete her work' (p. 31).

The main interest and value of the book of course lie in that part which is concerned with our Lord's teaching on the subject. To this three chapters are devoted (x.-xii.), entitled 'The Ministry of our Lord,' 'The Teaching of the Absolving Ministry,' and 'The Commission to Remit and Retain.' The nature of the power to 'bind and loose' in S. Matthew xvi. 19, xviii. 18, is carefully investigated, and Mr. Elwin sums up in favour of the view that it may well include both the meanings attributed to it, viz. that of forbidding and allowing *things*, and excommunicating and pardoning *persons*, both senses of the phrase being amply supported by quotations from the Talmud and Rabbinical authorities. The discussion of S. John xx. 19-23, which stands next, is perhaps the best part of the whole work. More than

half a
exam
vinci
(oper
terms
widely
has b
head
Epist
the l
title o
chapt
which
to an
agitat
exam
think
histor

W
autho
volum
no m
of *S*
earlie
Penit
very
know
and i
Will
the w

The

THE
subje
a logi
atten
gloom
at all
classi
the g
totall
real s

T
of re
reason
of th
as an
the n

half a dozen different explanations, or evasions, of the passage are examined separately and rejected as inadequate; and it is then convincingly shown that nothing short of a real power of absolution (operative as well as declarative) will satisfy the requirements of the terms used by our Lord; and those of our readers who know how widely the late Dean Stanley's volume on *Christian Institutions* has been read will acknowledge that plain and careful teaching on this head is as needful now as it ever was. A chapter on the Acts and Epistles concludes this part of the work, to which is appended the longest chapter in the volume, with the somewhat misleading title of 'Controversies on Penance,' misleading we say, because the chapter is devoted to a scholastic discussion of various questions which arise naturally out of the subject as already treated, rather than to any historical account of those controversies which have actually agitated the Church. Still the chapter is useful, and contains an examination of some points of considerable importance, although we think that the value of the book might have been increased had the historical method been followed.

We cannot conclude without drawing attention to the list of authorities and treatises on penance which is found at the end of the volume. This seems on the whole tolerably complete, but contains no mention of the very interesting *Treatise on Penitential Confession of Sin* published anonymously in 1657, but written several years earlier. This work is referred to by Marshall in the preface to his *Penitential Discipline* (p. xiv. A.C. Lib.), and, though copies of it are very rare, it is still in existence, little as it appears to be generally known at the present day. It seems a pity that a work so curious and interesting should not be more accessible to the general public. Will not some enterprising person or society take the hint and give the world a new edition of it?

The Ultimatum of Pessimism. An Ethical Study. By JAMES WILLIAM BARLOW, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1882.)

THE admirable qualities of Mr. Barlow's thought and style convert a subject which is not only very tough but also very unpalatable into a logical treat. An unpleasant subject it is, but eminently worthy of attention. Those who are only acquainted with pessimism as a gloomy or cynical temper, know nothing of the depths of that doctrine at all. This is but temperamental pessimism, which Mr. Barlow classifies under its three heads—of the wrathful, the despairing, and the grumbling—only that he may dismiss it as a mere affair of humour, totally different from that elaborate system of thought which forms the real subject of his study.

The true theory of pessimism is the work not only of reasoners, but of reasoners who, if you but grant their premisses, can scarce be reasoned against. Only concede that intelligence is a mere function of the brain, and what follows. In the first place, the idea of God as an intelligent existence separate from the world, departs, and in the next place, the idea of human life continued after the bodily organs

are dissolved, vanishes too. The originating power which gives the impulse to life becomes a something (if it be not too much to call it a thing) to which it is impossible to attribute any character, or even any individuality. The laws by which it works are only to be discovered by registering the order of evolution. And what then does our observation of evolution teach us? Does it present us with a progress in happiness which we may hope will lead in the future to the elimination of all disorder and pain? Such is the pleasant result which some derive from their observation of the world. But not so Schopenhauer, Hartmann, and their followers. To them it seems that every advance in the order of evolution is an advance in pain. Will is developed with increasing distinctness and power, first in the lower animals, and then, in a supreme degree, in man. And will implies a want of present harmony between the organism and its environment. For if the organism were in absolute agreement with what surrounds it, what would be left to will? At the same time intelligence develops; and what is intelligence but the obligation to reflect and the inability to lose the consciousness of self in our surroundings as a lower creature can do. So far from happiness growing as culture grows, the very reverse is the case. Culture involves decrease of happiness. And the true prescription for our sorrow is *Wiederverthierung*; that is to say, a return to the condition of beasts. This, however, we cannot effect. We are committed to a terrible progress, without respite and without hope.

This is a view of things which may easily be laughed aside. But the reader has but to peruse the summary of pessimistic argument which Mr. Barlow gives in order to see that the system is much more easily laughed at than refuted. Perhaps most men have seen enough of suffering in the world to know that if we set aside, in the first place, all expectation of a world beyond the present, and in the second all those illusions as to the joy which this world has to give, with which the weak encourage themselves, but which advancing intelligence must perforce dissolve, a case may be made for the essential misery of the system of the universe which is startling indeed. In fact the argument is so extremely formidable that its strongest refutation lies in its own completeness. It is a tremendous *reductio ad absurdum* of human life. One does not understand why a man who has once thoroughly accepted it permits himself to live an hour longer than the period which may be necessary to arrange for the benevolent murder of all for whose happiness he cares. Far less can one understand how any pessimist who professes any tinge of morality can commit the monstrous crime of propagating a race which is doomed but to grow in misery.

It is absolutely necessary for pessimists to give some reply to this. No system would have much chance of acceptance which involved the reasonable obligation of suicide and of childlessness; moreover it is a matter of fact that pessimists continue to live and marry, and they cannot allow that their practice is in contradiction to their principles. The answer to the question why a miserable race should live and multiply, when the power of self-extinction rests

in th
steps
But
been
the
conc
creat
is to
unfit
mise
his
with
this
to of
P
moti
desp
imm
in ev
to fe
pain
exist
is m
only
hard
Mon
Abs
scio
deve
desi
rega
muc
Perl
to li
we
pain
in o
hinc
con
it c
the

syst
mot
regi
imp
you
a fu
mal
find

in their own hands, is the ultimatum of pessimism. The various steps by which it is reached will be found in Mr. Barlow's book. But the conclusion is as follows: The conception of God having been rejected, there remains in the place which He used to fill, the Absolute, otherwise called the Transcendental, Being. Now, to conceive of this Being (if the word Being may be used) as happy, and creating for the increase of his happiness a race so miserable as ours, is to attribute to him a revolting selfishness which would utterly unfit him for our love or service. But if we conceive of him as miserable, and all the pain and suffering of the world as the effort of his misery to work itself off, then we cannot but feel a sympathy with him, and a desire to aid his weary work of self-relief. It is for this purpose that we must endure the burden of life and hand it over to others.

But it seems to us that there is hardly sufficient force in this motive to restrain the most self-sacrificing pessimist from the happy despatch; much less does it suffice to warrant him in imposing the immolation of a deadly life upon descendants who, as further advanced in evolution, will taste still more of its wretchedness than he is fitted to feel. To subject living and conscious beings to actual and tangible pain for the sake of an Absolute to which we cannot attribute even existence, not to say capacity for pain, save in a transcendental sense, is more than any religion has demanded, especially as the Absolute only attains individuality and consciousness in us, and can therefore hardly be understood to derive anything but misery from our misery. Moreover, we cannot know anything of the wants or desires of this Absolute Being except through the wants and desires which the conscious beings in whom he attains reality and individuality may develop: and if in the course of culture we are to be brought to a desire for non-existence, it is impossible to say why we should not regard that as the expression of the mind of the Absolute just as much as the absurd desire for existence which the uncultured display. Perhaps the Absolute may require our extinction, and in persisting to live we may be baulking him in an effort to relieve his pain. If we are, in Von Hartmann's own words, to regard the universe as 'a painful drawing poultice which the All One Being applies to himself in order first to draw out an inward pain to the surface, and then to hinder it for the future,' who shall say but that the extinction of conscious life as fast as it reaches the stage of evolution at which it comprehends its own misery may be the bursting of the blister and the sign that the patient is cured?

The reply which Mr. Barlow with great force urges to this monstrous system is this: that in order to reach your Absolute and act on a motive of sympathy for him, you must quite plainly pass out of the region of fact and experience into transcendental regions. Now, the impossibility of making this passage is the very ground on which you have previously rejected the idea of a future life. Why may not a future existence then be the answer to the question, how we can make life worth living? In the possibilities of the future life we may find the solution of the miseries of the present and the reconciliation

of culture and happiness. A future life may be reached not only with as little difficulty as that which has been experienced in attaining to the belief in a suffering Absolute, but even with far less. For the future life requires only a certain arrangement of atoms which in actual fact has already taken place. A mathematician endowed with sufficient knowledge might calculate the period at which the atoms will again in their ceaseless change and evolution produce a life which, taking up the memories of the present, just as one moment of our present takes up the memories of the past, might properly be called a renewal of our present existence.

This seems to be true. No one who realizes the wonderful fact that this life has actually been somehow or other evolved can deny that a future life may be evolved in the same way too; but men refuse to accept any future wonder, exactly as if the present had brought to pass no wonders at all. In fact, so evident a physical possibility is the future life that it hardly deserves to be called a transcendental conception. It is rather a natural extension of our observations upon actual facts.

But we have some doubt whether the future life *alone*, even if it could be made more probable than upon the theory of evolution we can well suppose it to be, would suffice to fill the gap. It might indeed show suicide to be useless; although a man might with apparent reason destroy his life even with the prospect that the course of evolution might bring it into renewed being. He might hope that that time would be distant, and intend when it came to destroy himself again if he finds things as bad then as now. But unless we had some reason to think that the future life will be happier than the present, it would at least be plainly insufficient to justify the propagation of the race. And the bare idea of a future life does not warrant any expectation that it will be happier than the present; growing misery in the present might give good ground for apprehension that the future would be worse still, and some one indeed has lately revived the horrible conception (which Jean Paul propounds as a dream) of an atheistic immortality of despair impossible to put away. We therefore feel disposed to wish that Mr. Barlow had urged upon the pessimist not the mere idea of a future life, but the idea of God in the first place, and secondarily of a future life derived from Him, as filling up the gap which must be filled if the continuance of existence is to be anything better than an absurdity. The existence of God requires certainly no greater effort to reach than does the suffering Absolute. It has the advantage, which the other altogether wants, of a universal tradition of mankind in its favour. Nor does it necessarily involve the notion of a happy being creating a miserable race, since a God may have such good things in store for the race as will entirely deprive it of the title miserable.

We are also inclined to question the complete justice of Mr. Barlow's remarks upon the value of argument from analogy. He believes that in the hands of Butler it did good service for a time, but is highly dangerous against our present enemies. It is hard to see how it can ever have done really good service unless it be founded

in the
idea
it w
exist
for t
hard
you
sider
an o
even
tain
perv
in th
of th
whic
belie
appl
endu

Butl
from
posit
God
ligion
but
natur
in G
pessi
sonin
think
cepti
liber
this
read

The

THIS
sent
terna
Syste
and
keen
the
the li
the
Vol
How

in truth. But Mr. Barlow appears to us to confound the general idea of argument from analogy with the particular application of it which Butler urged. It is certain that the assumption of the existence of an author of nature which Butler makes is not fitted for times in which to attain the belief in a God at all seems often harder than it is to accept the whole Christian system after once you have come to believe in Him, or for dealing with people who consider nature so bad that resemblance to her dealings with us would be an objection more than a recommendation. Yet Butler's argument, even as it stands, begins to have some force for anyone who entertains the notion even of an unknowable source of life. Even the perverse parody upon the belief and service of God which is found in the theory that we are to endure a miserable life to relieve the pain of the Absolute, gives ground for an argument of no slight force by which it might be shown that the principles on which you base this belief and this endurance can never find their real and complete application except in the form of belief in a suffering Saviour and the endurance of the cross for His sake.

But even were we to concede that the particular analogy which Butler urged has lost its force, that does not condemn the argument from analogy in general. It only compels us to urge it from another position. Butler argued that the submission which we all render to God as the author of nature requires by analogy submission to religion. We, on the other hand, must leave God out of our assumption, but we may still argue that the submission which men render to nature and her laws requires of them by analogy submission to faith in God and to religion. In fact Mr. Barlow's own reply to the pessimists appears to us to be a very able example of analogical reasoning, 'You believe in sympathy with a miserable Absolute; if you think yourself at liberty to use the faculties by which such a conception may be reached, you should by analogy feel much more at liberty to exert them so as to believe in a future life.' We commend this extremely suggestive book to the attention of the thoughtful reader.

The Dead Hand in the 'Free Churches,' with Pictures of their Inner Life, sketched by eminent Nonconformists. Edited by the Author of The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church. (London: Walter Smith, late Mozley, 1882.)

THIS powerful exposure of the two main pretences of modern Dissenting communities—that they are free internally and free externally—has reminded us of the trenchant letters on the *Voluntary System* which were published by the Rev. S. R. Maitland in 1834, and appeared in a second edition in 1837. With that bright and keen pen, which pricked not a few imposing wind-bags in its time, the scholarly Librarian of Lambeth revealed to his contemporaries the light which shone in the midst of the 'Dark Ages,' and exhibited the bondage and compulsoriness which lay hidden within the 'Voluntary System.' His method in both cases was the same. He was singularly free from viewiness and the conjectural *à priori*

habit of stating a case. He cited the monastic chroniclers of the Middle Ages and the Dissenting preachers and politicians of the first three decades of our century to speak for themselves, standing aside himself, and simply calling attention to their words. Hence his *Voluntary System*, which will be found to be still a most readable book, was an unanswerable attack upon Dissent conducted wholly by Dissenters. The long Latin word 'Voluntary,' in accordance with the modern change of fashion, has made way for the English word 'Free,' and in place of the 'Voluntary System' of Messrs. Burder, Pye Smith, Wilks, and J. A. James we have the same thing generalized as the 'Free Churches' by Dr. Allon, Mr. J. G. Rogers, and Mr. J. A. James's successor, Mr. R. W. Dale. The author, or compiler, of the *Dead Hand* has followed Maitland's precedent, with some slight difference in form and manner. The title 'Nonconformists' had not come into fashion in Maitland's time. He and his witnesses always use the more correct and historical title of 'Dissenters.' The new work is cast into the form of a dialogue between two friends, the Rev. Septimus Saywell, Vicar of Kingsford, and the Rev. Richard Riversdale, minister of an Independent chapel in Kingsford. We doubt if this form is the fittest for a controversial argument. The reader knows from the first that the victory is predetermined for one of the interlocutors; and this knowledge is not unlikely to raise some prejudice in a fair mind on behalf of the interlocutor who is destined to be beaten. Perhaps the very best work of this character, Bishop Patrick's *Friendly Debate between a Conformist and a Nonconformist*, loses by being cast into this form. The slight tincture of story given to the *Dead Hand* by its dialogue form may, however, attract and hold some readers, in spite of the fact which becomes so evident in the first chapter that the Rev. Mr. Riversdale is not really a Dissenter at heart. Every strong thing which is said for or against Dissent throughout the volume is spoken by some well-known living Dissenter, and is usually extracted from reports of the *Congregational Year-Book*, or from the columns of the *Nonconformist and Independent*, or other Dissenting newspaper. The general character of the argument of the *Dead Hand* may be described as a sustained and incontrovertible *tu quoque*. The older Dissent was theological and ecclesiastical: it assumed that the Church of England was 'unscriptural' in her doctrine and 'antichristian' in her constitution and discipline. The modern Dissent has departed from these traditions of its fathers and founders: the theology of Laud and Jeremy Taylor, or of Berkeley and Tillotson, must seem much more liberal and less terrible to the educated modern Dissenter than the theology of Owen, or Gill, or Joseph Hart, or of the trust deeds of his own chapel. Hence the difference between the Church and Dissent is shifted to a new ground. The Church is said to be internally and externally enslaved, whereas the Dissenting 'Churches' are internally and externally 'free.' The author of the *Dead Hand* remorselessly tears in pieces this baseless pretence, or rather stands aside and shows us the strange sight of eminent and representative Dissenters, such as

Messrs. Dale, Rogers, Allon, Stoughton, Conder, Parker, and a host of others, tearing it in pieces in sight of the world. His demonstration that Dissent, by its own confessions, possesses neither the inward nor outward freedom of which it publicly boasts is almost cruel in its severity. But the process is carried out by the demonstrator without a particle of bitterness; everything bitter, cruel, or damaging throughout the book is said by some well-known living Dissenter or quoted from the Dissenting journals of 1881 and 1882. The Dissenters again and again complain in these pages that they have no genuine internal freedom of self-development in the direction of any new light which may have dawned upon their pastors, that they have no liberty to follow out the new convictions or tastes which may spring up in the bosom of the 'voluntary churches,' because the pastors and churches are bound hard and fast by a rigid 'creed,' formulated in the trust deeds of the chapel. They are not even free to appeal to Holy Scripture against the doctrines of the trust deed. As to external freedom, in respect of independence from State patronage and control, the case is equally bad. The Independents alone have no fewer than two thousand chapels 'strictly tied up,' as a Dissenting newspaper complains, 'to be used only by ministers who hold the opinions set forth in the Deed by zealous but ignorant founders.' 'At this moment,' complains Mr. Baldwin Brown, 'many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing would induce them to utter from their pulpits.' If any 'free church,' or any member of a 'free church,' should contend that the minister is eating Calvinist bread while he is preaching anti-Calvinist doctrine, and quarrel should arise as to his title to his benefice, by whom must the question be settled? By the State. The contending parties must carry their quarrel before 'Cæsar,' if an English civil court be Cæsar. The secular power must examine the doctrine or creed of the 'free' and 'independent' church, and decide whether the minister is a conformist or nonconformist to the trust deed. If the State should decide against him, and he should nevertheless assert his liberty to preach in that chapel, he must be ejected by the secular arm. These points are brought out with great completeness of evidence—all the witnesses being typical Dissenters—in the thirty-one chapters of this vigorous and lively book. The argument is not a very high one; for it merely says to the Liberationist who sneers at the bondage of the Church, 'Dissent is just as much in bondage.' Nor is it a very deep one; for it does not strike at the theological and moral root of Dissent, which may yet produce other and worse growths than Independency, Anabaptism, or Methodism. But it has its use, and ought to be widely read. It will be especially valuable to anyone who is engaged in the defence of the Church of England against those attacks which are made upon her from the political side.

Œuvres Inédites de Bossuet découvertes et publiées, par A. L. MÉNARD.
Tome 1, Le cours complet sur Juvénal. 8vo. (Paris : Didot et Cie. 1882.)

THE volume which we introduce to our readers is the first of a series which is designed to comprise the *inédites* works of Bossuet ; it was discovered by M. Ménard in an old building near the ruins of the Château de Richelieu, together with some other MSS., and certainly deserved to be published, both on account of the celebrated prelate who was responsible for it, and of the pupil for whose instruction it was composed.

Three years ago, M. Ménard, in a pamphlet now partly reproduced, brought under the notice of the literary world the discovery he had made of Bossuet's papers ; very naturally suspicions were excited and doubts expressed as to the authenticity of the MSS. in question. The scandal created by the forged documents sold to M. Charles was still in everyone's recollection, and the feeling which greeted the alleged restoration of important literary treasures was invariably, at first, one of scepticism. In this case, however, no doubt was possible, and from the thoroughly sifting examination to which the two volumes purchased by M. Ménard have been subjected, we may boldly assert that we are now in possession of a portion of the prelate's works hitherto unknown, and unusually interesting because it is connected with his duties as tutor to the Dauphin.

We are all aware that, assisted by the Duc de Montausier, and Huet, Bishop of Avranches, Bossuet undertook the arduous task of training a child who seemed of the most ungovernable and wayward disposition. The course of instruction devised for that purpose included, as might well be supposed, a study of the classical authors of antiquity, and the volume now before us gives us the text of Juvenal with philological, historical, and moral remarks by the prelate. If the work had possessed a merely literary interest, we should not have noticed it in this journal, but we think that it is curious to see the lengths to which hero-worship can be carried. M. Ménard is extremely proud of having discovered some unpublished MSS. of Bossuet, and he feels anxious to make the most of his good luck ; but would anyone imagine *a priori* that the tutor of the Dauphin, the proud controversialist, the enemy of Protestantism, the champion of absolute power, the author of the *Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Écriture-Sainte*, becomes, in M. Ménard's preface, a quasi-freethinker, a democrat, a forerunner of Diderot and Voltaire? The following passage is one of the most amusing specimens of prejudice that we have seen for a long time :—

'The last Father of the Church (such is the title given to Bossuet by La Bruyère) is, after all, nothing else than a dilettante of all poetry and of eloquence, and the profane splendour of his lectures (on Juvenal), as learned as it is artistic, thus identifying the successor of S. Thomas with the rival of Demosthenes, the illustrious Bossuet will now throw off for posterity the absolute clericalism (?) of his traditional physiognomy. No doubt he extols inflexibly those hierarchies which bear the consecration of centuries (and not unreasonably, for we have seen to what an abyss

utopi
even
terni
ruins

V
day
pom
noun
hims
repre
did
appe
'wh
the a
likew
to th
sage
woul

I
really
as a
tlem
time
in th
are c
certa
again
of de
trait
the c
elega

Le I

REVI
with
they
least
befor
of m
desir
some
publi

I
the b
have
the
amin
utmo
can n

utopias can lead us); but he also celebrates with a feeling of earnestness, even under the roof of the Louvre, the true *Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity*, long before the three magic words had been inscribed on the ruins of the Tuileries.

We fancy some of the French radical *littérateurs* of the present day taking up M. Ménard's volume and asking whether the man so pompously celebrated in the preface is really the Bossuet who pronounced the funeral oration of Chancellor Le Tellier, who disgraced himself by his persecution of Fénelon and Madame Guyon, and who represented the principle of absolutism in the pulpit as Louis XIV. did on the throne. We grant most readily that the word *Liberty* appears frequently in his numerous writings, but it is the *Liberty* 'wherewith Christ made us free,' and it is a matter of doubt whether the admirers of M. Jules Ferry would be ready to endorse *that*. We likewise acknowledge unhesitatingly that Bossuet repeatedly alludes to the doctrine of *equality*, but it is the equality implied in the passage 'for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God:' and would not M. Gambetta have called this arrant clericalism?

If M. About, M. Sarcey, and the other critics quoted by M. Ménard, really admire the ethical doctrines inculcated by the 'Eagle of Meaux' as a comment on Juvenal's satires, we can only congratulate these gentlemen on their good taste; but we must remind them at the same time that the tutor of the Dauphin, whilst stating over and over again in the plainest possible language that kings, magistrates, and rulers, are established in authority for the good of their subjects, would certainly not have sanctioned an appeal on the part of the people against the abuses and crimes which are the almost infallible results of despotic power. Finally, if we object to M. Ménard's novel portrait of Bossuet, we thank him most warmly, on the other hand, for the care with which he has prepared and published this valuable and elegant volume.

Le Positivisme et la Science Expérimentale. Par M. L'ABBÉ DE BROGLIE. (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1881.)

REVIEWERS are presumed to have an extended general acquaintance with the literature of the subject treated in any great work which they criticize; or, if they cannot lay claim to such knowledge, at the least to have thoroughly mastered the work itself. In the case before us we feel bound to confess, not only that our comprehension of many of the questions at issue is far less complete than we could desire, but that we have not yet read every page of the two handsome volumes of large octavo which the Abbé de Broglie has published.

If it be asked how under such circumstances we venture to bring the book before the notice of our readers, our reply must be that we have expended a considerable amount of thought and study upon the themes discussed in these volumes; and further, that our examination of them has proceeded so far as to enable us with the utmost confidence to recommend them to that public which our voice can reach, as a most truly valuable and thorough contribution towards

the understanding and elucidation of at least one of the most important problems of our age. It is true that M. de Broglie's native country may be regarded as the home of Positivism. Still not only has M. Comte a large following in England, not only has his philosophy left a deep impression on the works of Grote, Mill, Buckle, and others, who would have shrunk perhaps from calling themselves entirely his disciples, but we must also take into account certain tendencies of British thought, both during our own and an earlier generation, if we would appreciate the needfulness of grappling with the teachings directly and indirectly springing out of Comtism. Even a glance at the pages now before us serves to show how frequently M. de Broglie is compelled to invite attention to English authors. They appear sometimes as allies, more or less in unison with his own modes of procedure, still more often as adversaries whose speculations must be contravened, if we are to be sincere and consistent in the profession, we do not say of Christianity, but even of a true and real Theism.

For it is Theism and nothing more which M. de Broglie assumes throughout as the basis of his reasonings. An able French critic of the book, M. Paul Janet, has justly observed that it contains nothing which can be objected to on theological grounds by any reader who is a Theist. We proceed, so far as it can be managed within our scanty limits of space, to set forth the main problem of these volumes.

The general outlines of Positivism have been well described by Archbishop Thomson in a lecture delivered at Edinburgh in 1868. He explained to his audience how this modern claimant to the title of a philosophy maintained that all knowledge was to be summed up in experience of facts acquired by the senses; that for the terms 'cause and effect' we ought to substitute 'invariable succession;' that the supposed distinction between essential and accidental qualities of objects must henceforth be banished alike from our phraseology and from our thoughts; that our apparent knowledge of things was only the knowledge of their relation to us—the knowledge, in short, of our own sensations; and that as the triumphal march of mechanism, chemistry, and physical science in general during the last century has been made through the means of the microscope, the spectrum analysis, and so forth, we must look to similar inductions as the sole means of progress in the realm of mental and of social science.

M. de Broglie's account of Positivism is substantially identical with this. Nor indeed do we suppose that the accounts of the matter drawn up by friendly hands, such as those of Mr. Mill or Mr. Grote, would be found to present any serious items of difference. But both Archbishop Thomson and the Abbé de Broglie proceed to point out the rarity; to say the least, of such a phenomenon as a tolerably consistent Positivist. In the words of Dr. Thomson: 'Comte, and Littré, and Paine, and Renan slide into language which, if true to their instinct, is false to their philosophy. They speak of type and aim and ideal. They let back into the world unawares the doctrine of a purpose in creation, of a thought that guides it!'

Now, one main object of the volumes before us is to show not merely that Positivists are inconsistent, but that they must necessarily be so. To this end is sought the aid of logic, of grammar, above all of that experimental science on which Positivism professes to take its stand. Nor is our author content with mere negations. He aims at the bolder and nobler task of supplying us with a system of philosophical creed in relation to the questions of our time, though not by any means of our time alone.

We have not space at present for anything like an *exposé* of this creed. It may, however, be safely described as taking its start from that common-sense philosophy of Reid, and of his allies of that Scottish school which made so great an impression on the France of fifty years since. But though starting thence, our author is conscious that this school laid too great stress on the unanalysed *primâ facie* convictions of the untrained intellect; and accordingly M. de Broglie attempts a modification in this respect of the Scoto-Gallican position. So far as this objection is concerned, he might have cited in support of it the language of his illustrious countryman, the late M. Victor Cousin. In his preface to his book entitled *Philosophie Ecossaise* (we quote from the third edition), M. Cousin, amidst his praises of the Caledonian school of metaphysics, declares that 'l'excellence de l'école écossaise n'empêche pas qu'elle n'ait ses défauts. Satisfaite du sens commun, elle s'y repose, et ne sent guère le besoin de pénétrer dans les profondeurs de la vérité.'

When, as is here the case, we thoroughly sympathize alike with the premises and the practical conclusions, with the whole aim and tone of a writer, it seems desirable to find out, if possible, from what quarter difficulties and objections may arise. We take up accordingly for the moment the position of an advocate of what we regard as in the main the wrong side. The work before us takes its first stand, as we have said, upon the basis of common sense. But the author, having seen the failure of a school that rested too exclusively upon the *data* thus furnished, seeks to establish principles and lay down rules for our guidance in the determination of the question, where we are to be content with the decision of common sense, and where we may legitimately make appeal as it were to a higher court, to the trained and cultivated reason. It may very probably arise from the circumstance that we have not yet mastered all the critical apparatus provided for us by the Abbé de Broglie, but we do not feel sure that we are yet in possession of any criteria sufficient to enable us to solve this very considerable primary difficulty.

Illustrations of our meaning may be easily supplied, and that from what may seem to many an unlikely quarter. It is from mathematical science that we take the first that occurs to us.

The schoolboy, who learns in his *Euclid* that it is of the essence of parallel lines that they should never meet, may very possibly jump to the conclusion that all other lines except parallel ones must, if produced in both directions, ultimately meet somewhere. It is surely startling to him to find, if he proceeds in due course to the study of conic sections, that there are lines (as for example the

ordinate and the curve of the equilateral hyperbola) which may be produced *ad infinitum*, and yet, though constantly approximating, never meet. It is hardly too much to say that average common sense—such at least is our experience—obstinately declines to believe this truth. It has never grasped the conception of a real line—length without any breadth. We cannot exhibit these non-coincident (or *asymptotes* as they are commonly called) to the actual eye. Hence the untrained intellect demands why it is to be called to give up its common-sense conclusion of disbelief. If it does so in this case, why not then in any other? What limit is to be placed to credulity? Why must it accept the authority of the mathematician?

We might turn to other provinces of mathematics; for instance, to the newly discovered *quaternions* invented by Sir William Rowan Hamilton. But for variety's sake let us glance for a moment at a page of the other Sir William Hamilton, the Scotch metaphysician, in whom M. Cousin recognized the most advanced pioneer of the common-sense school of mental science. Speaking of the possible position of the thinking principle, Hamilton writes: 'Some (and their opinion is not, certainly, the least philosophical) hold that in relation to the body, the soul is less contained than containing—that it is all in the whole and all in every part.' ('Lectures on Metaphysics,' Vol. I., Appendix 4.) And not to multiply illustrations, we will content ourselves with citing once again the well-known words of the hard-headed and sceptical David Hume: 'No priestly dogma ever shocked common sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.' In such problems as the position of the soul and the nature of matter, how far is the voice of common sense to be listened to? Where are the limitations and why are they to be insisted on? If, as is really possible, a prolonged study of the work before us even helps us on the road to a mastery of this difficulty, it will be one additional cause of gratitude to our author.

We might say much on the relation of the philosophy of the Abbé de Broglie to that of Hegel, and to that of M. Taine and Mr. Herbert Spencer; names which are prominent in his pages. But at present we confine ourselves to one general practical impression.

From America (witness the sermons of Mr. Phillips Brooks), from the testimony of thoughtful observers in England, and now from the evidence of the Abbé de Broglie as regards France, we learn that scepticism, rather than pronounced unbelief, is the mental epidemic of the day. Now, practically M. de Broglie seems to give us advice remarkably consonant with that contained in the pages of the eloquent American preacher, of Mr. Justice Fitzjames Stephen, and of an excellent discourse recently published by Dr. Liddon. M. de Broglie remarks that scepticism is harder to grapple with than a pronounced system of unbelief or misbelief. But he bids us take comfort. No man is a sceptic all round. Let us try to arrest his downward course at some point where he does feel himself to be on firm and solid ground. Start, for instance (with S. Augustine), from a man's admission of his own consciousness of identity. 'I

am I
see a
'I an
do n
every
legiti
subj
well-
asser
Fran
leavi
the
offic
has
purs
and
able
of h
taste
expi
man
phys
and
whic
EIN
wh
vess
Bro
pest
mon
den

Chu
II,
ma
line
con
the
flic
sor
sets

abs
of
ass
all
pat
not

am I' carries him who admits it a great deal further than he may see at a glance. 'I am that I, who has done much that is wrong.' 'I am that I who cannot even imagine myself ceasing to exist.' We do not seek for the moment to press these principles further. But every thoughtful mind must see how much further they can be legitimately pressed. We may possibly be able to recur to the subject.

Meanwhile we heartily thank the Abbé de Broglie for his clear, well-arranged, lucid exposition of his case. Admirers of his family assert, that for the last three centuries it has always supplied to France an Admiral, a Marshal, or a Prime Minister. Our author, leaving to his brother the Duc de Broglie the study of history and the domain of politics, was, if we mistake not, in earlier years an officer of the Royal or Imperial Navy. In changing his profession he has joined that considerable list of men of eminence in secular pursuits who have trodden in the path of such saints as a Cyprian and a Hilary of Poitiers, and brought into the ministry many valuable gifts which have been won from secular pursuits. That a son of his father and a grandson of Madame de Staël should unite a taste for abstract reasoning with the power of clear and graceful expression is a natural heritage. But his studies for scientific seamanship have given him a real and lively acquaintance with the physical science of his age; and the Honorary Canon of Evreux and of Paris has trained himself for the chair of Christian Apologetics which he now occupies by working assiduously as the *Ancien Elève de l'Ecole Polytechnique*. Many of his countrymen and friends, who had hoped to see him hoist the national flag on board the vessel of an Admiral, may live to confess that Prince Paul de Broglie is doing as good service for France, amidst seas with tempests and dangers of their own, in what the world regards as the more humble career of his new sphere of really exalted and self-denying duty.

A communication made by Dr. Andrew Clark to the Derby Church Congress (which will be found in the *Guardian* of October 11, 1882) may be referred to here, because, as coming from a man of science, it forms a striking and instructive comment upon a line of thought which appears from M. de Broglie's book to be very common in France as well as in Great Britain. Physicists say to theologians: 'You see *we* state certainties; *you* are constantly inflicting on men's minds mere theories, which do not admit of any sort of verification.' Dr. Clark's summary of the counter-position sets forth such important positions as the following:—

'That there is nothing absolute in the whole objective world; no absolute standard of mass, quality, or duration; and that the knowledge of an absolute primitive weight of atoms is impossible. . . . That the assumption, constituting the fundamental axiom of modern physics, that all true explanations of natural phenomena are mechanical, is incompatible with demonstrated facts. . . . That there is no law of physics, not even the law of gravitation, without great and growing exceptions.

. . . That therefore the boasted accuracy and permanence of so-called

physical laws and theories is unfounded ; that very probably the greater part of the so-called axioms of modern physics will be swept away as untenable ; . . . and that after all there may be methods of spiritual verification which within their condition, scope, and use, may compare not unfavourably with the methods so confidently depended upon in physical research.'

Règlement donné par la Duchesse de Liancourt à la Princesse de Marsillac; avec une notice sur la Duchesse de Liancourt. Par LA MARQUISE DE FORBIN D'OPPÈDE. (Paris: Plon, 1881.)

BIOGRAPHY forms the best supplement to history, and in the charming little sketch before us every thoughtful reader will recognize one of those 'lives' which were to France the very 'salt of the earth,' preserving her in the darkest times of her social life from utter corruption. The title scarcely describes the work, for the notice, placed first, and merely intended as an editorial introduction, occupies half the book, and forms its most interesting section. The '*Règlement*' is a rule of life, in the style of S. François de Sales, but written by a seventeenth-century grandmother to her granddaughter, both standing high in the brilliant Court circles from Henri IV. to Louis XIV. The '*Règlement*,' edited by an Abbé Boileau—not the brother of the poet—was first printed in 1694, twenty years after the untimely death of her for whom it was written. A century later, the second edition appeared on the eve of the Revolution, only to be thrown aside and lost, till sent forth under the present able and appreciative editorship.

Jeanne, Duchesse de Liancourt, was the only daughter of Henri, Maréchal Schomberg. Statesman and soldier, in spite of his mass of public business, he found time to give to his little Jeanne '*une éducation sérieuse et forte*.' And further, in a quotation from Abbé Boileau, we have some details of her occupations under her father :

Comme il lui trouva beaucoup d'ouverture d'esprit, il lui donna quelque connaissance des plus grandes affaires, lui faisant lire des négociations et des traités, lui dictant des dépêches, et lui en faisant faire pour l'exercer.'

What would our modern damsels say to such 'schoolroom work'? It may be well for those who think that women are now educated to a pitch of usefulness never before attained, to weigh well the Marquise de Forbin's description of a great lady's duties, in an age when public life early absorbed all the men :

' . . . Tandis que leurs maris, retenus loin du foyer par la vie militaire et les charges de cour, ne demandaient à leurs intendants que de fournir à leurs dépenses; c'était ordinairement sur elles que retombait le fardeau des affaires. Les femmes visitaient les terres, administraient les biens, comptaient avec les fermiers, signaient les baux et les conventions, et avaient la haute main sur l'éducation des enfans.'

A wide sphere truly, and that Jeanne was equal to it all we cannot doubt, as we mark in her instructions to her grandchild the soundest advice given on all these important topics ; she herself having wisely

administered her husband's immense wealth, when his own extravagance threatened to impair their fortunes.

Mademoiselle de Schomberg was destined to the heir of the Duc de Sully, but on the disgrace of that family, her father tried to force her into a marriage with the son of the Duc de Brissac, a youth unpleasing in mind and person. In spite of her attachment elsewhere, and her tears and despair, the Maréchal stood firm, and the ceremony took place in 1618, to be annulled by the Church immediately afterwards, on the ground of want of mutual consent. 'On les démaria,' and Jeanne gave heart and hand to Roger du Plessis Liancourt. Her wifely devotion and many virtues succeeded, after long years, in winning him from a life of selfish extravagance and licentiousness; and she retained her sway over him until her death. Their only son, Henri Roger, made an unhappy marriage with Elizabeth de Lannoy, and fell in the trenches at Mardyck, leaving his posthumous daughter, Jeanne Charlotte, to his mother's care. Round this infant all her hope and joy circled; strongly Jansenist in her sympathies, the little one became at five years old a pupil of the Mère Angélique, though a strong desire for the convent was steadily discouraged. She was married to the Prince de Marsillac, but died early, leaving infant children, and her death seems to have broken Jeanne de Liancourt's strong and tender heart; she only survived her granddaughter a few weeks.

Not the least interesting feature in the memoir is the short but masterly sketch of Jansenism and the Port-Royalists. The De Liancourts formed part of the brilliant constellation of nobles that gathered round the school of Arnauld, De Sacy, and other leaders, numbering the Princesse de Longueville, the Marquise de Sablé, the Duc de Luynes, and many others in its ranks. The Marquise de Forbin seizes well on the weak point in Jansenism, the tendency to a dogmatic sectarianism, estranging itself from the corporate life of the Church:

'Le Catholique se contente de préférer telle doctrine à telle autre, telle pratique pieuse à telle autre, sans rien exclure de ce que l'Eglise admet. Le sectaire n'a qu'un point de vue. Tout ce qui n'entre pas dans le cadre qu'il s'est tracé n'existe pas à ses yeux, ou, s'il existe, doit être retranché, sinon condamné. C'est ainsi que cédant chaque jour davantage à l'esprit sectaire, Port-Royal en vint à s'infliger de cruels démentis.'

Of the '*Règlement*' which forms the subject of the book we need not say much; it must be read to be appreciated. There is scarcely a womanly duty, public or private, on which some valuable precept is not given, all based on the highest and purest principles of Christian life as drawn from the Gospels. The practical common-sense is a distinguishing mark of the whole; as when she directs a young mother never to suffer her son to be coerced in the matter of a profession or her daughter into convent-life, or either into a repulsive marriage. Was she thinking of the cruel blight that had threatened her own young life? The Marquise de Forbin furnishes an interesting parallel by placing in foot-notes selections from the code given a century earlier by Anne de France to her daughter Suzanne

de Bourbon. Most readers will agree with her that there is at least a century in improvement, culture, and knowledge of the world between Louis the Eleventh's Anne de France and the Court-lady of Anne of Austria. Here and there, both these good women unconsciously lift a veil, showing a glimpse of social manners so corrupt, that a woman living in its midst, and keeping her heart with all diligence, was indeed an evidence of that strength which is perfected in our weakness.

The last twenty pages contain '*Le Règlement que Madame de Liancourt avait dressé pour elle-même.*' She who taught another well taught herself. When we read the rules by which this remarkable woman guided her life in the closet and the Court, we number her among those whom a husband's heart can safely trust, whose children rise up and call them blessed.

Such a record of such a character is too valuable to be a mere literary curiosity; and we think that the Marquise de Forbin has rendered a service to her sex in thus placing before them the life and mind of Jeanne, Duchesse de Liancourt.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1883.)

THIS book is designed to meet what has long been felt to be a great want. Work of all kinds is being carried on in the Church, but when accurate information concerning it is required, it is very difficult to obtain. For many years the various bodies of Nonconformists have issued their 'Year-Books,' in which all that it is thought desirable should be known concerning their respective denominations is chronicled. Not so the Church of England. It seemed as if those charged with the administration of her affairs were afraid of letting the world know what was being done, or as if they dreaded a punishment like that inflicted upon King David for numbering the people if they ventured to place on record the deeds of piety performed by Churchmen. So far as we can trace, the errors in this volume are chiefly on the side of omission. And for the first year or two of the existence of such a summary of work this is only to be expected. At first information is obtained with difficulty and after great labour, and is comparatively incomplete. Each year fills up one or more gaps; and so in time, if care is given, the desired completeness is secured. The editor has divided the work of the Church under a series of heads or chapters. In the first of these he tells of the organizations, general and diocesan, for assisting candidates for holy orders who need pecuniary help; of the theological colleges in which they may be educated; of the examinations they will have to undergo, with the report of a committee of the Northern Convocation on the diaconate and the requirements for fulfilling that office; and of certain spiritual exercises which have been employed for quickening and elevating the religious life of the clergy. The second chapter deals with the home mission work of the Church under a variety of heads, which we need not enumerate. Then we have chapters on the educational work of the Church; its foreign missions; the

increase of the episcopate at home and in the colonies, with some account of what has been done and is doing to secure the requisite funds for endowing other sees; choral associations; the councils of the Church, including in that very wide word not only the two Convocations, but Church congresses, conferences, &c. &c. Beside these we have a chapter containing reports of Churches in communion with the Church of England; one on clergy charities, endowments, &c.; another with a list of ordinations, preferments, and obituary of the year, the latter embracing a short account of the more distinguished clergy who have died during the year; then another chapter containing a chronological record of events; and after that a chapter with the names of many of the more important contributions to Church literature, ranged under various heads; after which there are more than a hundred pages of 'statistical records.'

But we should be uncandid if we stopped here. The present volume will be useful, but we think it might be made much more useful. The editor seems to us not to have quite grasped the ideal after which his book should be fashioned. An 'Official Year-Book' should aim to place the facts with which it deals in a very clear and condensed form, and to avoid all temptations to amplify and improve the occasion. Moreover everything contained in the book should be in a form capable of being quoted; an 'Official Year-Book' should be rather a quarry, in which others may find the materials they require for building, than a finished building. Again, we have, in juxtaposition, two sets of reports, which show exactly the kind of information which we think the *Official Year-Book* of the Church ought to give and ought not to give. The first is the report of the two Convocations. Clearly and concisely it tells exactly what subjects were discussed, and what conclusions were arrived at; and though the proceedings of the Southern Convocation lasted for eight days, and there were two houses to be reported, and those of the Northern Convocation lasted for three days, fifteen pages suffice to tell all that needs to be told. But when we turn to the Church Congress at Derby, where no conclusions could be arrived at, and though it lasted only four days, we find more than fifteen pages occupied with a *précis* of the papers read and some of the speeches delivered. So, too, with Chapter XII., on recent Church literature. It fills twenty-six pages, is almost necessarily very imperfect, and the descriptions of books are too short to be of any practical value, and must very often be only misleading. We have taken these as examples; we hope that another year will see the excision of all such useless matter. The only other point to which we would call attention is the unsystematic arrangement of the information given and consequent want of perspicuity in bringing out prominent facts. It seems to us that the statistical portion of such a book is its most important feature. Each chapter, therefore, should be headed by a clear, definite summary, wherever possible in tabular form, of what is being done. Take as an example what is said of lay readers. It is of far more importance to have a statement of the number employed in each diocese than to have the forms by which

they are to apply for a licence, and by which that licence is given. Then, again, the chapter on Church extension should have been ushered in with the tabular statement of the number of churches consecrated in each diocese.

We thank the editor (the Rev. F. Burnside) for his share of the work, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for undertaking the venture, and we confidently look forward to great practical advantage to the Church from such a publication.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, ETC.

The Charge of the Archdeacon of Maidstone, *Disestablishment and Disendowment by Instalment, and Piecemeal* (Rivingtons) deals especially with the question of burial fees and the agitation conducted by the Liberation Society. It has valuable notes.

Among recently published Sermons we would note an excellent one addressed to the Ely Theological College by the Bishop of Colchester (Rivingtons); one of singular earnestness, preached by the Bishop of Ely to the Ely Branch of the Church of England Working Men's Society, under the title of 'S. Paul as a Working Man' (Cambridge: Spalding); and a sermon entitled *Many Members and One Body* (Edinburgh: Grant), preached at Glasgow before the Representative Council of the Scotch Episcopal Church by the Bishop of Durham. It is difficult to find out for what persecuted people it is that Mr. Begbie pleads in a sermon called *Toleration* (Rivingtons), preached on 'Temperance Sunday,' which appears to have been Nov. 12th, last year. It is only the really temperate who seem now to need protection.

A brochure entitled *On the Revised Version of the New Testament*, by the Rev. Edward Marshall (Parker & Co.), takes a sensible view of the whole subject, and is fairer to the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort than the majority of recent criticisms.

Mr. Duke's most important and suggestive pamphlet, entitled *The Question of Incest relatively to Marriage with Sisters in Succession* (Rivingtons, 1883) has most deservedly gone into a second edition. We rejoice to say that the Marriage Law Defence Union, 20 Cockspur Street, continues its most useful work with energy and success. Its publications deserve a very wide circulation.

It argues well for the growth of theological and psychological study that such a solid work as Mr. Heard's *Tripartite Nature of Man* (Edinburgh: Clark) has reached another, and that a fifth, edition.

Prebendary Meyrick's reprint of Bishop Cosin's *Religion, Discipline, and Doctrine of the Church of England* (Rivingtons) has appeared in a second edition. This little treatise was written at the instance of Clarendon. It would be found useful in many places at home. The Anglo-Continental Society have translated it into almost all European tongues.

Dr. Baker has published, for the use of his upper forms in Merchant Taylors' School, a concise and scholarlike *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles* (Rivingtons). We recommend it for use in schools of a higher grade, as a supplement to Dr. Maclear's invaluable Hand-books.